



IVP601- February 2025

Betrayed by the System in Brazil

28 February 2025, by [L.M. Bonato](#)

Given the rise of conservative parties following Jair Bolsonaro's presidency, far-right politicians are seeking to roll back legal abortion even in the case of rape. Congressman Sóstenes Cavalcante has introduced Bill PL 190424, which would criminalize abortion under all circumstances after 22 weeks of pregnancy.

If passed, this legislation would subject rape survivors to unbearable psychological burdens, forcing them to carry pregnancies to term. Meanwhile their aggressors face much lighter penalties.

Impact on Survivors

Due to his role in spreading disinformation, Jair Bolsonaro is currently ineligible for public office. However his influence is felt with the introduction of Bill PL 190424. Largely supported by members of the Congressional evangelical caucus, the bill is an affront to the secular state established in Brazil's constitution.

Brazil is a predominantly Christian country, a slight majority Catholic but with evangelical congregations growing rapidly. In the face of social inequality they project a deeply conservative "prosperity gospel."

While many may support the bill from a deeply religious and moralistic viewpoint, it is criminalizing the victims of abuse, not their abusers. Moreover, religious beliefs have no place in public health and policy. Abortion is a human right, recognized by the UN and World Health Organization.

The bill was marked "urgent" through a symbolic vote lasting just 23 seconds. Although this designation has since been revoked due to significant public pressure, the bill remains under congressional review and could still be passed.

This congressional proposal starkly reflects a state that not only fails to protect its citizens but also exacerbates the trauma endured by victims, further penalizing them by forcing them to carry the physical embodiment of their trauma for the rest of their lives.

The bill's proponents argue that adoption after birth is "an option." Yet this completely disregards the will and psychological needs of the person, who may face gestational depression, the dangers of younger victims to safely give birth, as well as the bureaucratic inefficiencies of Brazil's adoption system. Societal prejudices hinder adoption and as a result, post-adoption support is inadequate. Brazil's adoption system is already overwhelmed.

Judicial delays can take up to 10 years, often leaving children eligible for adoption only in adolescence while most prospective parents, aiming for easier familial integration, prefer infants or toddlers under three.

The "Child

Pregnancy Bill"

Those most affected by Bill PL 190424 would be underage girls, and it's already being referred to as the "Child Pregnancy Bill."

Children, especially those from marginalized communities, take longer to recognize abuse and seek legal support. The psychological toll of processing the trauma and overcoming the stigma, even from medical and legal professionals, further delays access to legal abortion, often pushing the pregnancy beyond the 22-week limit.

According to a 2022 study by the Brazilian Public Security Forum, the country recorded the highest number of rapes in its history, with 74,930 victims, 75.8% of whom were cases of statutory rape. This alarming figure highlights Brazil's culture of rape and pedophilia, which the state fails to dismantle — instead, it institutionalizes the crimes through patriarchal structures.

Under this bill, women and girls who terminate pregnancies resulting from rape could face up to 20 years in prison. They would be convicted as murderers and detained in juvenile facilities until they could be transferred to the adult prison system — punishment that is not only cruel but also disproportionate, as rapists themselves face sentences ranging from six to 12 years, almost half the penalty imposed on the victims. Indeed, how many abusers are ever

held accountable?

This dangerous inversion of roles discourages abuse reports, as victims, understandably opting for illegal abortions, would avoid formal complaints to escape such harsh consequences. Considering that most child sexual abuse in Brazil is perpetrated by family members, this is even more concerning. Victims, often coerced by their families into silence, would be denied legal support.

Criminalization and Trauma

For those who experience sexual violence, the trauma does not end with the act itself. Forensic examinations are frequently insensitively handled, meaning that survivors can be exposed to immediate post-trauma humiliation. They not only face the possibility of an unwanted pregnancy, but the questioning of what they may have done to cause their own victimization.

Yet “pro-life” advocates argue that the “unborn child” should not be punished, claiming that one crime does not justify another.

This means they prioritize the “rights” potential life over the rights of the pregnant person. How can one justify coercing a person to risk their health and well-being in order to bring a fetus to term?

The dominant Christianized notion in Brazil posits that “life begins at conception,” as the soul supposedly enters the body, making it sacred before birth. Debates on the nature of

life vary. But the right to abortion cannot be restricted to one’s religious belief. It is a public health issue.

Denying this right strips affected women of ownership over their own bodies. Undermining female autonomy insults human dignity, placing a wide range of reproductive rights under the control of the church and state.

Where abortion is a legal right, no person with a uterus should be forced to continue a pregnancy or to undergo an abortion. The far right maintains that abortion, a safe and legal procedure in many countries, is coercive. But that stands the reality on its head — without access to abortion one is condemned to continuing a pregnancy despite the dangers and problems that may entail. By forcing women to carry unwanted pregnancies, the state turns their bodies into sanctuaries for abuse, where trauma solidifies and renews daily.

Criminalizing abortion does not reduce abortion rates — it only makes the procedure less safe. An estimated 70% of abortions in Brazil are performed clandestinely.

The Fight Against Oppression

Women who choose to terminate pregnancies, even when it’s legally prohibited, have resorted to unsafe methods that can result in irreversible consequences. Annually around 200,000 hospitalizations are due to unsafe abortions, predominantly among young and impoverished women.

At the beginning of the 21st century, Brazil’s rate of maternal mortality stood at 45.8 per 100,000. With unsafe abortions the fourth leading cause of death.

Protestors across Brazil have taken to the streets in hundreds of peaceful demonstrations against Bill PL 190424 — the largest being 10,000 marching in São Paulo — and forcing national media coverage. Feminist organizations, social movements, and human rights collectives are mobilizing to resist this proposal and demanding that the government respect women’s rights. Thus the feminist movement is not just demonstrating against this reactionary bill, but confronting the entire dismal state of reproductive rights.

Only five years ago Brazil and Argentina had similar restrictive abortion laws, although Argentinian feminists were able to work more openly. At the end of 2020 Argentina’s congress passed a law that made abortion available upon request for the first 14 weeks of pregnancy and guarantees access to abortion services free of charge in both public and private health care facilities. This was the result of a sustained movement that involved massive demonstrations.

Clearly the fight for female freedom and autonomy must be a collective effort, extending to all women confronting patriarchal systems worldwide and opposing every form of gender oppression and restriction of women’s rights. International solidarity can play a crucial role in amplifying resistance beyond South America’s borders.

[Against the Current](#) 28 February 2025

Trump, Putin and the war in Ukraine: Europe’s painful awakening to the rise of global Fascism

27 February 2025, by [Hanna Perekhoda](#)

A fascist regime is taking hold in the [United States](#). In [Russia](#), it has

already been in place for three years – a reality that many preferred to

deny, clinging to the illusion of a smooth return to normalcy, to a status

quo that was seen as only temporarily disrupted by **Russia's war against Ukraine**.

The same status quo that allowed the European Union - **Germany** above all - to continue importing cheap Russian hydrocarbons while exporting high-end products to China and the United States. A world so comfortable that the Ukrainians, in their stubborn resistance, became nothing more than a nuisance. If only they had accepted to live under the occupation of a regime that rapes, kills, and tortures on a massive scale, perhaps we could have continued to prosper indefinitely... An illusion as naïve as it was cynical.

While Western Europe set aside its investments in defense, Russia, on the other hand, used its energy revenues to modernise its military apparatus. The annexation of Crimea in 2014 and its numerous influence operations across Europe - including crimes and assassinations - have gone virtually unpunished. In 2022, when Russia invaded **Ukraine**, the European system of prosperity and stability, built on moral corruption, collapsed.

Yet, European leaders clung to this illusion, limiting their ability to impose swift and effective sanctions against Russia and delaying aid to Ukraine at a critical moment - when it had the best chance to shift the balance of power on the battlefield. This hesitation allowed Russia to seize territory and strengthen its positions, making Ukraine's counter offensives significantly more costly.

Having focused all our efforts on shutting our eyes to reality, we now find ourselves stunned by a situation where all our reference points have collapsed within a matter of weeks. J.D. Vance's **speech** in Munich is a striking example of this.

J.D. Vance made it abundantly clear: his enemy is not **Vladimir Putin**, with whom the incoming U.S. administration shares many ideological affinities. His real enemy is in Europe - it is all those who resist the order he seeks to impose. The same man who advocates building walls to keep out migrants also wants to ban "barriers" against the **far-**

right in Europe. As *The Guardian* aptly **described**, it was a call to arms for populist right-wing forces to seize power across Europe, with the promise that the "new sheriff in town" would help them do so. Nothing must stand in their triumphant march.

The statements emphasizing the urgent need for European countries to radically and rapidly increase their military spending are, unfortunately, correct

Yet, barriers against this assault on Europe do exist. The first line of defense is European civil society, its democratic institutions. But there is another bulwark: the effort of millions of Ukrainians who, for the past three years, have been fighting to halt the rise of Russian fascism.

This barrier could collapse at any moment, while Europe continues to watch, nodding in passive acknowledgment, failing to see that the same murky waters are already seeping in from within.

The crackdown on migrants, the institutionalisation of misogyny and homophobia, the denial of **climate change**, the ruthless exploitation of both people and nature, the liquidation of Ukraine, the deportation of Palestinians - these are the pillars of the emerging new order, already taking shape. By now, this should be as clear as day: abandoning the victims of military aggression - just as we have done with the Palestinians and are now preparing to do with the Ukrainians - amounts to giving autocrats free rein to impose their rule through brute force.

This is a simple equation that any rational person should be able to grasp. It is all the more perplexing, then, that **Donald Trump's** actions and those of his administration have apparently shocked Europeans. After all, he has repeatedly made it clear that this is exactly how he intends to act. What is truly surprising is not Trump himself, but rather the Europeans' lack of preparation and strategic foresight.

The statements emphasizing the urgent need for European countries to radically and rapidly increase their military spending are, unfortunately, correct. According to *The Financial Times*, Russia's military spending **has now surpassed** the combined defense budgets of all European countries. By 2025, Moscow will allocate even more funds to the war - 7.5% of its GDP, amounting to nearly 40% of the national budget.

This is one of the advantages authoritarian regimes hold over democracies: they can rapidly mobilise human and economic resources for war, imposing coercive measures without fear of mass opposition. An authoritarian state, whose population has been steeped in a late-capitalist ideology of cynicism and individualism - as is the case in Russia - can take this logic even further. Yet Europe seems blind to another fundamental reality of authoritarian regimes: once an autocrat embarks on a war of expansion, he cannot simply stop. The survival of his regime becomes inseparably tied to the war, which eventually consumes the entire structure of power.

European leaders, exemplified by Emmanuel Macron and Olaf Scholz, who now speak of the very real need to strengthen Europe's defense, are the same ones who paved the way for this crisis. They condemn abuses of power on the international stage while tolerating Darwinian logic within their own societies - sustaining a system where the most powerful continue to dominate the most vulnerable. This contradiction weakens their credibility and fuels growing distrust toward democratic institutions. Such inconsistency creates fertile ground for the rise of fascist movements, which capitalize on these fractures to mobilize a disillusioned electorate.

Widening inequalities, a growing sense of injustice, and the perception of a political elite disconnected from reality weaken their legitimacy. A society that feels abandoned or ignored will struggle to support international commitments, even when they uphold fundamental principles such as the defense of rights and sovereignty.

**The
crackdown
on
migrants,
the
institutiona
lisation of
misogyny
and
homophobi
a, the
denial of
climate
change, the**

**ruthless
exploitation
of both
people and
nature, the
liquidation
of Ukraine,
the
deportation
of
Palestinian
s - these
are the
pillars of
the
emerging
new order,
already
taking
shape**

Populists exploit this discontent by fueling the notion that governments are sacrificing national interests in favor of supposedly distant causes, such as supporting Ukraine. Political figures like Jean-Luc Mélenchon in France and Sahra Wagenknecht in Germany denounce social injustice while embracing the law of the strongest on the international stage, justifying the violations committed by authoritarian regimes such as Russia. Their opportunistic positioning, driven by electoral calculations, strips their rhetoric of any credibility. Yet, it is impossible to separate domestic social justice from a country's international policies. A society that tolerates or even encourages cynicism and domination on the global stage will inevitably normalize these same

dynamics in its internal social relations - and vice versa.

A more just and cohesive society is better equipped to support international commitments and defense budgets - whose necessity is now undeniable. Effective and urgent redistribution policies are essential to restoring citizens' trust. Thus, the assistance that European countries can provide to Ukraine is not limited to military or economic aid; it also hinges on resolving their own internal crisis of legitimacy. However, it must be repeated again and again: the aid that truly matters for every Ukrainian is military aid. It is the single most crucial condition for Ukraine's survival as a society, as well as for each of its people.

Many, particularly in Germany, express concerns about the influence of the far-right in Ukraine. Yet, nothing fuels extremism more than an unjust "peace agreement" imposed on a victim of aggression against its will. No situation is more radicalizing than military occupation paired with systematic and brutal oppression. If Ukraine is forced to accept a peace dictated by Russia, the accumulated frustration and injustice will serve as fuel for radical movements, which will thrive at the expense of moderate and progressive forces. History is filled with examples of imposed peace agreements that have given rise to monsters - terrorist organisations born from despair and resentment.

Trump openly declares his willingness to negotiate without regard for the Ukrainian government or its people. In doing so, he aligns himself entirely with the Kremlin's agenda and retroactively legitimises Russian aggression. Worse still, by refusing to call this invasion what it truly is - an illegal war of aggression, accompanied by egregious violations of international law and documented war crimes - he sends a deeply dangerous message. He reinforces the idea that such expansionist policies can not only be tolerated but even rewarded. Taiwan, the Philippines, the Baltic states, Moldova, and Armenia must now prepare to be next on the list. In this context, it is imperative to take a firm and unequivocal stance: no negotiations can take place at the

expense of the Ukrainian people, and even less so without their consent.

The time for lamentations is over. The moment to act is now. For one day,

when the dust settles and the fog lifts, we will inevitably ask ourselves in horror: how could we have been so passive, so blind, so indifferent in the face of this impending disaster?

voxeurop 23 February 2025

Trump, Musk dismantle the welfare state, fire federal workers— and they respond

26 February 2025, by [Dan La Botz](#)

Trump and Musk have been wielding axes, swinging wrecking balls and driving bulldozers, at a variety of government offices. Musk's Department of Government Efficiency is supposedly going after 'waste, fraud, and abuse,' but Trump fired 18 inspectors general whose job was precisely to monitor waste, fraud and abuse. Several of them filed suit saying Trump's action was illegal.

Musk's team of twenty-something techies, swooped in and took over the Treasury Department with all of its data on personal finances from the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration. Several states sued and the courts have temporarily stopped the takeover.

Trump and Musk have also worked to shut down a number of agencies that protect public employees and other workers. They took over and fired workers at the Whistleblower Protection Office, National Labor Relations Board, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board. The courts ordered that some of those workers be reinstated.

Trump and Musk have so far suddenly and callously fired 20,000 government workers but they have 200,000 employees in their sights. Moving so rapidly and carelessly, they foolishly fired and then had to rehire workers, such as those veterinarians working on the bird flu epidemic and other employee dealing with nuclear weapons security. The unions sued, but the judge said he had no authority because it was a labor case and told them to take it to the Federal Labor Relations Authority—whose chairwoman Trump just fired.

How do Trump and Musk justify what they are doing? Conservatives had long held that government agencies—with the exception of the military and the police—generally serve no useful purpose. Social programs for children, the elderly, the disabled and the poor are not only useless, but pernicious, undermining individual initiative. And government regulations stifle private enterprise. Trump and Musk might appear to be rightwing anarchists opposed to all government, but in reality, they want a government which cuts their taxes and ensures their profits. Their motives are all too transparent and some who voted for Trump have

begun to wake up.

Two large national protests represent the first stage of a mass, working class response. On February 17, Presidents' Day, thousands rallied in cities large and small across the nation under the banner "No Kings on Presidents' Day." I joined a demonstration of a few hundred at the San Diego County administration building in California where many of the speeches and signs had a rather patriotic tone, defending American democracy against the dictators Trump and Musk.

A week later, federal workers of all sorts demonstrated at about 30 "save our services" rallies in cities around the nation, most at federal facilities but also at offices of Musk's SpaceX offices and his Tesla showrooms.

"The only way we have out of this is if the federal workforce on the front lines puts out a call to the broader labor movement and enter the streets and make this a political crisis that they cannot manage," Chris Dols, president of Local 98 of the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers who works for the Army Corps of Engineers told Labor Notes. And he's right.

Ukraine Solidarity Under the Trump Administration

25 February 2025, by [Ukraine Solidarity Network-U.S.](#)

Anyone with an ounce of compassion wants this war to end as soon as

possible, but it is morally unacceptable for outsiders to demand

that Ukraine surrender. USN continues to support the right of the

Ukrainian people to self-determination and to decide for themselves what are acceptable terms for a peace deal. USN will continue to build moral, political, and material support for the people of Ukraine in their resistance to Russia's invasion, to its occupation of Ukrainian lands, and to its repressive rule over people in the Russian-occupied territories. USN will continue to support Ukraine's war of resistance, its right to determine the means and objectives of its own struggle, and its right to obtain the weapons it needs from any available source.

USN opposes the changes in US policy on Ukraine for the worse under the new Trump administration. The Biden administration at least condemned Russia's illegal war of aggression and supported Ukraine's self-defense, even if that military aid came with many strings attached and was often too little and too late to defeat the Russian army on Ukrainian land.

Now the Trump administration is posturing as a "neutral" broker between Russia and Ukraine, as if the aggressor and its victim are equally at fault. But in practice, the Trump administration is publicly supporting Russian demands and rejecting Ukrainian demands. Trump's calls for U.S. "ownership" of Gaza in Palestine and for U.S. annexation of Greenland, Canada, and the Panama Canal are as brazenly imperialist as Putin's attempt to annex Ukraine.

USN opposes any attempt by the Trump administration to make a deal with Putin over the heads of the Ukrainians and to try to force it on Ukraine by threatening to withdraw humanitarian, economic, and military support for Ukraine. We further condemn the Trump administration's demands for effective control of Ukraine's mineral resources and other economic assets. The Trump administration has already frozen billions of dollars in humanitarian and economic aid that supports millions of Ukrainians, including:

- Millions of displaced war refugees inside Ukraine and abroad
- Tens of thousands of disabled veterans

- More than 100,000 HIV/AIDS patients
- Firewood for people without power due to Russia's war crime of bombarding civilian energy infrastructure
- Repair and reconstruction of power plants and distribution grids
- Grants to small farmers for seeds, fertilizer, and the replacement and repair of war-damaged farm equipment, grain storage silos, and ports for food exports

- Independent media and civic organizations
- Budget support for social services and public utilities

The Trump administration has also disbanded the Department of Justice task force charged with enforcing sanctions and anti-corruption laws against Russia's wealthy political elites and oligarchs.

As the Russian war against Ukraine enters its fourth year, USN will continue to work for Ukraine's victory over the Russian invaders, criminal accountability for their war crimes, and their payment of reparations to fund reconstruction.

- We support the armed and unarmed resistance of Ukrainians against the Russian occupying power.
- We support economic sanctions against Russia's war machinery, including its political, military, and economic elite, its access to the international financial system, its imports of weapons-related technology, and its exports of fossil fuels.*
- We demand that all Russians incarcerated for war resistance and political dissent be freed and that war resisters and political dissidents seeking refuge abroad be granted asylum.
- We demand that the tens of thousands of Ukrainian children kidnapped to Russia and Belarus be returned to Ukraine.

• We demand that the tens of thousands of Ukrainian civilians from Russian-occupied territories incarcerated for opposition to the occupation be released and returned to Ukraine.

• We support asylum in the U.S. for Ukrainians, Russians, Belorussians, Haitians, Venezuelans, Afghans and all people seeking refuge from political repression and war.

• We demand the cancellation of all of Ukraine's illegitimate and unjust foreign debts.

• We demand the confiscation of Russian assets abroad to be used to support Ukraine's military self-defense, social services, and post-war reconstruction.

• We oppose the U.S. policy of imposing a neoliberal economic agenda on Ukraine today and for its post-war reconstruction.

The Ukrainians' struggle for self-determination, democracy and social justice will continue. We support the political struggles of Ukrainian trade unions, women's organizations, environmental initiatives, and progressive political organizations to reverse the neoliberal anti-labor and anti-social policies of the Ukrainian government, to expand social, labor, and democratic rights, and to implement a just and ecological reconstruction of Ukraine. We will continue to build material aid and public education campaigns linking trade unions, civic organizations, and progressive political organizations in the U.S. with their counterparts in Ukraine. We urge all opponents of imperialism to join us.

* The question of sanctions is complicated and controversial among activists committed to Ukraine's struggle. It's especially important in the USA that we do not accommodate to the predatory politics of the imperialist U.S. state. The Ukraine Solidarity Network will be discussing these issues as the betrayal of Ukraine unfolds in collaboration with our Ukrainian comrades whose lives and national freedom are on the line.

[Against the Current](#) 22 February 2025

Genocide and Beyond

24 February 2025, by [Against the Current Editors](#)

Such pronouncements may have been previously unimaginable, but no longer. As divorced from reality as Trump's Gaza fantasy is, we must not see that corner of the world as a mere local crime scene: It epitomizes what's become the normalized collapse of what was thought to be a secure, "rule-based" global system, along with a looming explosion in U.S. domestic politics. We will attempt here to explore the interconnections.

The colossal scale of Gaza's destruction, the reality of perhaps ten thousand unrecovered bodies under the debris, the annihilation of the health care system, the targeted killings of 200 or more Gaza journalists — all these are only pieces of the picture of the Israeli state's attempt to pulverize an entire society beyond hope of reconstruction.

And yet, despite everything — January 27 saw hundreds of thousands of Palestinians returning to northern Gaza, seeking to rebuild shattered homes, families and communities out of almost nothing. It's criminal for anyone to fantasize that Gaza or Palestine have "won" this hideous war, but the mass return to the area that the Netanyahu government openly intended to depopulate shows that Israel hasn't "won" either.

The people of Gaza, even amidst the rubble, have reclaimed their agency to make clear that no Arab regime, no matter how corrupt or servile to U.S. imperialism, could afford to indulge Israel's ultimate ethnic-cleansing fantasy.

During Phase One of the fragile ceasefire that may never see Phase Two, the release of some of the Israeli captives held hostage by the military wing of Hamas or other factions, and freedom for a few hundred among tens of thousands of Palestinian prisoners held by Israel, was of course welcome. This can't hide the magnitude of the Gaza horror, or the fact that an unknown number of the hostages have died in Israeli air

strikes or building demolitions. Nor are we justifying the fact that on an incomparably smaller scale, the Hamas-led attack on October 7, 2023 committed murderous crimes against civilians.

Right now, might the European Union be prepared to punish Israel over its blatant ceasefire violations and threat to renew the assault on Gaza that Netanyahu promised, with all its catastrophic consequences? And will Israeli society — despite the revenge lust that has consumed much of it since the October 7 attack — continue to support a government that would sacrifice the remaining hostages' lives to satisfy its ambitions of conquest?

Without knowing any of that, it is possible to reflect on some lessons of the past and present. How could what passes for "the international community" allow the annihilation of Gaza to happen in broad daylight? A stunning juxtaposition of events on January 27 may help to highlight this tragic question.

Then and Now

The march of half a million Palestinians returning to what remains of northern Gaza happened to coincide with the ceremonies on the 80th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau death camp complex in Nazi-occupied Poland.

Watching these events side by side was overpowering, not least as Auschwitz survivors in their 90s spoke of their fears that "it could happen again" in a world of rising nationalist and racist hatreds. It's an invitation, even a commandment, to face why it is indeed happening again when it's so much more visible and preventable.

Regarding the Nazi holocaust, historian Arno J. Mayer wrote his book *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* to explore the world's relative indifference to the genocide as it became known. What about today? It's

not that genocidal crimes should be measured against each other in terms of their scale, or the meaningless question of which is "worse" — but one can compare how global powers responded or failed to respond in their respective times.

The Nazi holocaust occurred in the context of an all-consuming world war that for many countries posed the question of physical survival. Second and related, as the Verso Books publisher's summary observes:

"Mayer demonstrates that, while the Nazis' anti-Semitism was always virulent, it did not become genocidal until well into the Second World War, when the failure of their massive, all-or-nothing campaign against Russia triggered the Final Solution."

The real extent of the Nazi exterminationist campaign had begun to emerge around late 1942, and only by 1943 was it becoming widely known. (The early mass slaughters in Nazi-occupied eastern territories were mostly under the radar.) Furthermore, whatever the Allied powers knew and when, there was effectively no way to stop it — despite some wishful thinking, for example, that they "could have bombed the rail lines to the death camps," which were at the outer limit of the air capacity of the time — except by defeating Nazi Germany in the war.

Antisemitism of course played a role in why there was not great wartime concern over the fate of the Jews of Europe. But this would become a much bigger factor after the war, when the great Western democracies mostly closed their doors to desperate holocaust survivors, leaving masses of Jewish refugees nowhere to go — except to Palestine where the Zionist movement needed them to come, setting the stage for what became the 76-year, and continuing, Palestinian catastrophe.

Unlike the World War II Nazi genocide, the Israeli-U.S. Gaza assault

has happened in the open, “the first live-streamed genocide” as it’s been accurately described. The only way not to see it is by deliberately choosing not to look.

Further, halting this genocide could not have been simpler: Only with the massive continuous supply of U.S. weapons could the Israeli military sustain the pace of the war beyond a few weeks. A “Stop” order from Washington at any time would have suspended the slaughter.

It’s not that this would have resolved the fundamental issues of occupation and ethnic cleansing that preceded and led to October 7 — issues that the war in any case has only made worse — but tens of thousands of Palestinian lives and hundreds of thousands gravely wounded, several hundred Israeli soldiers, and dozens of hostages, would not have been needlessly lost.

Keep in mind too that unlike the 1940s when there was general unconcern (with heroic exceptions) for the fate of Jews, today there is overwhelming global popular sympathy for Palestinian lives and freedom.

By and large the world’s elites either don’t care, or align with what the critical historian Ilan Pappé calls “Global Israel” — spearheaded by U.S. imperial power and Christian Zionism — but among the people the tide is with “Global Palestine.” (Professor Pappé’s new book on Lobbying for Zionism in the United States and Britain is reviewed elsewhere in this issue of *Against the Current*.)

All this is why we must continue to insist that the Gaza genocide is the permanent record of Joe Biden’s presidency. Nothing else comes close, and nothing is more pathetic than the question of whether Gaza “tarnishes his legacy.” Gaza is Biden’s legacy, and nothing can “tarnish” or varnish it — including the lunatic acts of his successor in the White House, who promised to end the disaster and instead is expanding it. What was Biden’s war is now Trump’s.

As for the most ominous comparison, go back to the observation from Arno Mayer that the Nazis’ vicious

antisemitism became fully genocidal with “the failure of their massive, all-or-nothing campaign against Russia.” The comparison is not exact, but we see today the failure of a “massive, all-or-nothing campaign” by the Israeli state against Palestinian society, whose people refuse to capitulate despite the indescribable destruction inflicted on them.

That points to the chilling potential for Israel’s endless war against Palestine to become literally exterminationist in the coming period. Equally, it shows how much is at stake for the movement globally and especially for that in the United States in defense of Palestinian rights and freedom. We must also fight for the defense of basic rights of speech, dissent and organizing here in the United States, which the Trump gang and the Zionist lobby intend to destroy.

Irreparable Harms

The irreparable harm that’s been done in Gaza only begins with the “official” documented 47,000 deaths — grotesquely undercounted — close to half of whom are children. The loss of limbs, the profound psychological and physical trauma, the destruction of education and health care, and more, will affect the next two generations at a minimum. And the rampage of military and settler pogroms are sweeping through the occupied West Bank shows what the entire Palestinian population is confronting.

The particularly brutal impact on women in Gaza is a huge story in itself, which we briefly discuss elsewhere in this issue of *Against the Current*. As for the effects on Israeli society, it suffices here to point out how soldiers have filmed themselves, and posted on social media, committing war crimes for their own and friends’ amusement. Add to this the evidence of mass execution sites in Gaza, about which we’ll be learning more in coming months.

Even as Israel has become an international human rights blot, Israeli soldiers’ open glee in displaying their crimes is an indicator of where much of that society is heading, and the poison that will feed back into its

polarized politics. Antiwar activists in Israel concede that progressive forces there are unable to bring change from within, and that international action is required to prevent the resumption of all-out — and as we’ve suggested, potentially exterminationist — war.

The Home Front

If Gaza shows us what “the rule-based international order” ultimately amounted to, it really can’t be seen separately from the wreckage of what were supposedly impregnable safeguards in the U.S. political structure.

Donald Trump and Elon Musk’s intentions to destroy constitutional protections and institutional barriers against presidential dictatorship and the destruction of labor, racial justice, gender rights and any other obstacles to unrestrained corporate greed, show as little concern for the “security” of people’s lives in the United States as they have for Gaza.

Trump’s promises to bring down grocery costs won’t be kept anytime soon, or ever. (Have you checked the price of eggs lately?) For the lives of U.S. working-class families and communities, the rhetoric about the “new golden age of prosperity” will be soon enough be shown for the fraud it is.

Two points stand out about the Trump-Musk agenda and the blizzard of overreaching executive orders. First, it’s a war against the majority of the U.S. population, even though most folks don’t yet recognize that reality. It’s about more than arbitrarily slashing the federal work force, as damaging as those cuts will be for essential services, freezing Congressionally-approved spending on programs, denying transgender medical care, or targeting prosecutors for doing their jobs investigating the January 6 Capitol riot. These are chaotic, but systematic elements of an emerging program of austerity along with authoritarian presidential rule.

Second, the transactional and corrupt character of this administration is amazingly open. New York mayor Eric Adams is being shielded from prosecution, in exchange for his collaboration with Trump’s mass-

deportation program. Ukraine is about to be thrown under Putin's tanks, with U.S. aid to depend on the supply of Ukraine's vital minerals to the United States. Private prisons, the Trump family and cronies, and uber-billionaire Musk himself will be gorging at the trough of contracts while basic government services are gutted.

Why much of the U.S. capitalist class is opting for Trump's virulent economic nationalism, trade wars against allies as much as against strategic adversaries (China), and destruction of basic government

functions, requires a deeper analysis than is possible here. How far the rampage will go, the effects on the global and U.S. economy, the outcome of rulings in the courts and whether Trump might defy them, and what happens in Congressional budget battles — all are also open questions.

We do know that our movements, above all the struggles for immigrant communities, gender rights and justice for Palestine, are in the crosshairs. The bits of good news include the rapid-response networks forming in cities across the country against deportations, and the beginning of the fightback by federal

workers and their unions.

The current U.S. administration is both a center of the anti-democratic global white-nationalist far right and an Amen Corner for Israel's more extreme factions. It's clear that domestic as well international popular pressure on our own imperialist government is now even more urgent, not just for the survival of Palestine but ultimately for our own.

Against the Current -> <https://againstthecurrent.org/atc235/genocide-and-beyond/> 19 February 2025

DRC: The need for a ceasefire

23 February 2025, by [Paul Martial](#)

Despite the announcement of a unilateral truce by the M23, the group continues to advance towards South Kivu. An intense battle took place in Nyiabibwe, 70 kilometres from the regional capital Bukavu. The DRC's armed forces are being reinforced by those of Burundi, which has deployed more than 10,000 troops.

Formal condemnation

The violence has been documented in a major city like Goma, but these reports overlook the many war crimes committed by the M23 against the inhabitants of the villages along their path of conquest. The disapproval of the Rwandan intervention in the DRC is almost unanimous. On the other hand, divisions are emerging over the sanctions to be adopted.

China, traditionally reserved when it comes to taking a stance on conflicts in Africa, has taken a stand in favour of demanding that Rwanda and the M23 withdraw from the conquered territories. China exploits 70% of the country's mines and is concerned about its economic interests. At the same time, Rwanda remains an excellent client in the infrastructure sector.

For Europe, the unease is tangible. The EU has signed a trade agreement on rare minerals with Rwanda in the full knowledge that three quarters of this production comes from the looting of mines in the DRC. As for France, it depends on Rwandan troops to secure its oil installations, particularly those of TotalEnergies in the Cabo Delgado region of Mozambique.

Disappointing result for the DRC

Tanzania hosted a summit bringing together the two regional entities representing Central Africa (EAC) and Southern Africa (SADC). The two bodies called for an immediate ceasefire for humanitarian operations. They have also merged their peace mediation. Another decision was to organise a ceasefire security plan in the next few days. In the absence of more precise information, interpretations differ. For Kinshasa, the plan implies the departure of M23 troops from Goma.

Finally, the summit calls for the opening of direct negotiations between the DRC and the M23, which Congolese President Tshisekedi has always refused. Given the balance of power, it would appear that he no

longer has a choice, especially as religious leaders within the DRC have come out in favour of dialogue with the armed group. While the EAC and SADC have pledged their support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the DRC, they have not called for the Rwandan troops to leave.

Regional reconstruction

Even if the proposed cease-fire goes ahead, it is unlikely that the DRC will return to its previous situation. The Rwandan intervention has enabled the DRC to get its hands on major mining resources which, in addition to financial gains, strengthen its position as a supplier of raw materials for the energy transition in rich countries. This intervention has also opened up new opportunities for a number of countries in the DRC, which Uganda and Tanzania intend to take full advantage of. But it has also raised concerns. Burundi, which has long been opposed to Rwanda, takes a dim view of the fact that troops allied to Kigali are stationed in South Kivu close to its border. Unfortunately, the risk of the conflict spreading, as it did in the DRC at the end of the 1990s, cannot be ruled out.

While Rwanda's violation of the DRC's sovereignty must be condemned, the fact remains that the big capitalist

countries continue to profit from the Congo's wealth, leaving the countries of Central Africa to fight for the

crumbs.

[L'Anticapitaliste](#) 13 February 2025

Peace between neofascists and war on oppressed peoples

22 February 2025, by [Gilbert Achcar](#)

What makes the scene even more hideous is that the United States is a full partner in the genocidal war that is waged against the Palestinian people in Gaza, with some of its momentum presently moving to the West Bank. The Trump administration has even rushed to cancel the limited measures that the previous administration had taken in an attempt to deflect the blame, especially the freeze on the export of one-ton bombs that contributed greatly to the destruction of the Gaza Strip and the extermination of its people, as well as to the war of elimination that Israel waged against Hezbollah in Lebanon. Rather, as expected, except for those who tried to escape the bitter reality by projecting their dreams onto it (see "Two Myths About the Gaza Ceasefire", 21 Jan. 2025), the new administration has outdone its predecessor in Zionist bidding with Trump's call to permanently displace the residents of the Strip, i.e. to implement what international law calls "ethnic cleansing" - a crime against humanity.

The Zionist-US neo-fascist axis converges with Putin's Russia in the racial hatred of oppressed peoples. Moscow has excelled in this area, not only by its colonial aggression against Ukraine, repudiating its national sovereignty, but also in the Arab region, where it played a key role in the destruction of Syria and the extermination of a huge number of its inhabitants, while being openly

complicit with the Zionist state in allowing it to bomb Iranian sites in Syria at will (as part of the rivalry between Russian and Iranian influences in that country). Moscow's foreign minister even equated Russia's war on Ukraine with Israel's war on Gaza, comparing the Putinist description of Ukraine's rulers as Nazis to the Zionist description of Hamas as Nazis. It was likewise noteworthy that Moscow's reaction to the criminal deportation project uttered by Trump has been restrained, even compared to the explicit condemnation issued by some of Washington's traditional allies, such as France.

Here are now the Americans involved in killing hundreds of thousands of Gazans meeting with the Russians involved in killing hundreds of thousands of Syrians, the two parties sharing with the Zionist state a common contempt for the territorial rights of peoples. They are meeting on the territory of an Arab state that, if it were truly concerned for the Syrian and Palestinian peoples, should have been so averse to the two parties that it would not even occur to them to ask it to host their meeting.

What we are witnessing in reality is nothing less than a redrawing of the world's political map, moving from the Cold War confrontation between a Western bloc that claimed to uphold the values of liberal democracy (and has consistently betrayed them) and

an Eastern bloc in which dictatorial regimes prevailed - from that confrontation to the dissolution of the Western system, after the Eastern system, as a result of the deadly crisis that struck liberal democracy and the global rise of neofascism (see "The Age of Neo-Fascism and Its Distinctive Features", 4 Feb. 2025). The era of the New Cold War that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of its bloc, provided the transition by combining the law of the jungle with unrestrained neoliberalism. Washington played the main role in giving both features prevalence over international law and development based on welfare and environmental protection.

We are now witnessing a convergence between neofascists at the expense of oppressed peoples, as the new fascism, like the old one, openly denies the peoples' right to self-determination. The remaining liberal governments in Europe are stunned, after having relied for eight decades on US protection of the Western system without daring to form a global pole independent of Washington - not only militarily, but primarily in the field of foreign policy. The result is that the oppressed peoples of the world are no longer able to benefit from the rift between great powers that existed in the past but must now wage their struggles of resistance and liberation under more difficult conditions than ever before. The case of Palestine is the clearest evidence of this.

France: A united response to the pro-austerity and racist government?

21 February 2025, by [Fabienne Dolet](#)

After three motions of no confidence on 6 and 10 February, the French national assembly approved the state budget and the social security budget, which were hardly different from those presented by the then prime minister Barnier in the autumn of 2024. The current government, led by François Bayrou, which wants to reduce the public deficit to 5.4% of GDP by 2025, has cut the budgets of several ministries: public development aid, ecology, culture, agriculture, research and higher education. A few gestures on natural disaster prevention, the Green Fund and the budget for the French Overseas Territories. Local authorities continue to lose 2.2 billion euros.

Measures that hit the hardest

A temporary effort in income tax for the wealthiest households should bring in around €2 billion. The 'exceptional contribution' (for this year only) on the profits of large companies should bring in €8 billion. VAT on gas and electricity will be raised from 5.5% to 20% on 1 August, while the tax on financial transactions will rise to 0.4%. No mistake for a right-wing government!

[L'Anticapitaliste](#) 13 February 2025

To take account of inflation, the budget increases the brackets on the

income tax scale by 1.8%. According to the Ministry of the Economy and Finance, this measure will enable 619,000 taxpayers to avoid paying tax. How charitable! On the other hand, the wealth tax has still not been reinstated. And still no progressive tax scale... far from revolutionary! The measure lowering the VAT exemption threshold for self-employed entrepreneurs from €37,500 to €25,000 of annual turnover has been withdrawn. While the government has abandoned the idea of extending the number of days civil servants have to wait before being entitled to sick pay to three, the compensation rate has been reduced from 100% to 90%. It's a double penalty: sick and less pay!

A racist, austerity-minded government

The budget for the AME (state medical aid) has been cut by €111 million compared with Michel Barnier's budget, to maintain it at the 2024 level (around €1.3 billion). A symbolic reduction for a Prime Minister who is talking about a debate on what it means to be 'French' and the 'droit du sol'. A right called into question by Pasqua in 1993 when he was in the Balladur government... with Bayrou, then Minister for National Education. Bayrou's way of serving up the soup to

all the far-right politicians gives Retailleau and Darmanin free rein, whether on immigration or juvenile justice.

Censorship, a tool!

Those who, like the Socialist Party, have allowed this budget to be imposed in the name of responsibility cannot claim to represent the interests of young people and the working class as a whole. The ridgeline on which these MPs walk is so narrow that they can be thrown into the arms of the Macron party at any moment by trying so hard to distance themselves from Jean-Luc Mélenchon's la France insoumise (LFI) party. So it is with the extreme political polarisation, reflecting the very tangible conflict between capital and labour, between profits and public goods.

LFI, for its part, can pride itself on holding the line against the coherent attacks of the right and the far right and being useful to our social camp on an institutional level. It's clear that the divided left does not lack a programme - there is that of the Nouveau front populaire (NFP) - but mass support for that programme, militant and united support that can be seen on the streets and in mobilisations, that can be organised and unionised, and that can overcome the apparatuses and their leaders. This is the broad front we need to build.

Trump transforms global alliances and will establish a new era of colonialism

20 February 2025, by [Dan La Botz](#)

In the Middle East, Trump, who admires the authoritarian Benjamin Netanyahu and supports Israel,

proposes to end the war there by turning Gaza into a U.S. colony and removing the two million Palestinians,

in violation of international law. He suggests sending the Palestinians to Egypt and Jordan and hints that Saudi

Arabia might pay for his plan. Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have all objected to his plan, but Trump threatens to cut U.S. aid to them if they don't go along. Once removed, the Palestinians, Trump says, will not be allowed to return to their country. With a realtor's eye, he says Gaza will become "the Riviera of the Middle East," an international resort, and one suspects that he himself might turn it into another Trump golf course.

In the western hemisphere, Trump wants to expand America's control in the region that forms the base of its world empire. He says that he will by force, if necessary, take Greenland, a possession of Denmark, a member of NATO. Trump also wants control of the Panama Canal, claiming that China now controls the crucial waterway because a Chinese company has operations in ports on both the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the canal. Trump's threat has led the country's president José Raúl Mulino Quintero, in order to mollify Trump, to accept U.S. deportees of African and Asian

origin in his country. Trump also wants to absorb Canada making it the fifty-first state, a statement that Prime Minister Justin Trudeau called, "a real thing," that is, a genuine threat. But there's "not a snowball's chance in hell" that it will happen, says Trudeau.

In another break with past practice, Trump is using tariffs aggressively not only against competitors like China but also against allies like Canada, Mexico and the European Union. Trump has for the moment delayed the 25% tariffs he proposed for Mexico and Canada, but increased those on Chinese goods by 10%, to which China responded in kind.

Trump's immigration policy has also caused conflict. When the United States deported undocumented Colombian immigrants' home in military aircraft and bound in shackles, leftist president Gustavo Francisco Petro refused to allow the plane to land because the country's citizens were not being treated with

dignity. Threatened with 25% tariffs, Petro yielded and urged undocumented Colombians to return home to avoid further friction with the U.S., saying he would provide support for those who came back. Petro also canceled an \$880 million contract with Occidental Petroleum to engage in fracking, stating, "I want that operation to be sold, and for the money to be invested in clean energies. We are against fracking, because fracking is the death of nature, and the death of humanity."

Finally, the decision by Trump and his partner billionaire Elon Musk to shut down the U.S. Agency for International Development, or USAID, America's 60-year-old soft-power arm, has led to the sudden cancellation millions of dollars in humanitarian aid—food, medicine, schools—in 100 countries and to the firing of many of the agency's 10,000 international employees. Trump has thus become an enemy to millions. Detestable!

15 February 2025

Argentina: 'Anti-fascist and anti-racist pride' against Milei

19 February 2025, by [Fabrice Thomas](#)

Feminist and LGBT groups

Hundreds of thousands of people demonstrated in Buenos Aires under the banner of 'Anti-fascist and anti-racist pride', convened during the week by university assemblies (the one in Buenos Aires was attended by 5,000 people), initially at the initiative of feminist and LGBT groups, then at the call of a large number of social, cultural and political groups and organisations. The event was repeated in more than 120 towns and cities across Argentina.

Milei, who is still able to take advantage of political and macro-economic stabilisation that is generally favourable to him, has rekindled the fire that has been

smouldering in all sections of the population since he came to power.

The vast majority of the population is suffering from a serious deterioration in their living conditions: inflation, which is still high, even if it is falling; redundancies; and a deterioration in public services. But apart from two days of trade union mobilisation in January 2024 and May Day, and numerous local struggles, the economic dimension has not been the dominant one in popular reactions to Milei's policies. The biggest demonstrations over the past year have focused on social issues, the memory of the dictatorship and the defence of the university.

A groundswell of support for democracy

This time it was clear that there was a massive outpouring of head-on opposition to far-right ideology. All sections of the population (albeit predominantly the middle class), all types of opposition and all types of struggle against Milei were present. Young people, women and LGBT communities in particular. But all united by a common political will to defend democracy in all its aspects.

Faced with this groundswell of support, Milei backed down for the first time. Affirming that his words had been misrepresented, he declared that he 'respects homosexuals' and

hinted that, contrary to the statements made by his Minister of Justice, he would not repeal a law that severely punishes femicide. The future of the movement will depend on its ability to sustain itself.

In the absence of a political representative to embody it, it can count on the repetition of local and university assemblies and the preparation of the next street

mobilisation dates, on 8 March for International Women's Rights Day and on 23 March, the day of remembrance against the dictatorship.

[L'Anticapitaliste](#) 13 February 2025

Understanding the Implications of US Vice President JD Vance's Confrontational Speech at the Munich Security Conference

18 February 2025, by [Daniel Tanuro](#)

US Vice President JD Vance's speech in Munich, Germany, is characterised by extreme clarity and brutality. According to Vance, "the greatest threat looming over Europe comes not from China or Russia". Rather, it stems from Europe's cancellation of elections rigged by the pro-Putin far-right in Romania, Britain's prosecution of a far-right anti-abortion activist, and the EU's (thus far) refusal to permit complete "free expression" of racist, fascist, and misogynistic hate speech on social networks, as well as electoral manipulation (as in Romania specifically). Putin is rubbing his hands with glee, and the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) openly applauds JD Vance.

There can be no doubt: a strategic agreement exists between Trump and Putin aimed at dividing spheres of influence in Europe and establishing authoritarian far-right regimes in their respective zones. This agreement involves breaking the Ukrainian people's resistance in the East whilst supporting the far-right that already dominates Hungary and Italy, or participates in government in several other countries, and risks coming to power in Germany and France. Trump and Putin are clearly collaborating toward this end, as demonstrated by Trump's recent statements supporting

the dismemberment of Ukraine and regime change in Kyiv.

This represents a major turning point. While it appears suddenly in broad daylight today, it hasn't emerged from nowhere. It expresses capital's necessity, in a context of intensified competition, to establish authoritarian regimes to continue destroying society and nature for profit—by liquidating democratic and social rights, and denying scientific warnings about the severity of the ecological-climate crisis.

Thus, we can clearly see the emergence of a project for a multipolar world dominated by the Trump-Putin-Xi Jinping triad. Within this triad, the struggle for hegemony between the USA and China will give Russia a pivotal role. Trump's gifts to Putin are precisely aimed at distancing him from Xi. (In this context, note that Trump's ramblings about defending Christian faith also carry certain meaning.) Simultaneously, all this is motivated not only by fear but also by Trump and US Big Capital's admiration for the remarkable "efficiency" of Chinese high-tech despotism, which in just a few decades has built a capitalist economy capable of threatening the US empire's global pole position...

while keeping the masses under control. Hence the rallying of the Zuckerbergs and Bezoses to Musk's crusade—the lumpen-capitalist making the fascist salute.

Faced with this project, some will believe they must mobilise to defend the EU as an embodiment of "democratic values". This overlooks the fact that the EU is a profoundly despotic structure defined not by these "values" but as "an open market economy where competition is free". As such, it actively participates in the world's shift toward the far right, both through its anti-social policies (austerity, persecution of migrants, etc.) and by unravelling its very insufficient (and very unfair!) supposedly "ecological" policies.

The only way forward for a left worthy of the name is to fight for democratic and social rights, and against ecological destruction, whilst working to rebuild internationalism from below. This requires breaking with the campist poison of those who rejoiced at the prospect of a multipolar world, imagining this world would promote "peace" and the emancipation of peoples. Instead, it promotes war and oppression.

14 February 2025

Serbia's Mass Protests Against a Crony-Capitalist Government

17 February 2025, by [Tamara Knežević](#)

Soon after the roof canopy of Novi Sad's central train station collapsed last November 1, killing fifteen people, a TV reporter asked local journalist Igor Mihaljević to respond to the event. With devastating and incisive judgement, he offered the context missing in Western media coverage of the incident and the protests of the last few months.

For one, Mihaljević noted, this was the latest incident in the often tragic history of Serbia's second-largest city. In its past, Novi Sad suffered the genocidal Hungarian army campaign that massacred Jews, Serbs, and Romani across the region. That was in the same era as the devastating military occupation of Yugoslavia by Nazi Germany and its client states. More recently, there was the seventy-eight-day NATO bombing campaign in 1999, which killed 527 Yugoslavs and hobbling major cities like Novi Sad by taking out key infrastructure. But this time, Mihaljević argued, was different — for now it was the Serbian state itself killing its people.

The train station collapse has left both the city and the nation in shock, triggering primal fears of the sky falling overhead. Many Serbs, especially in Novi Sad, now regard overhead structures with suspicion, with some even avoiding the newly constructed, Chinese-funded high-speed railway. However, the aftermath has also sparked a powerful wave of protests, so intense that they threaten to topple President Aleksandar Vučić, sending shock waves through his corrupt Serbian Progressive Party (SNS).

Student Protests

Led by student organizers from over thirty universities and faculties — most notably the faculty of dramatic arts in Belgrade, which began the call to action in late November — the movement has rallied around four key

demands. One is the release of all internal documents related to renovations at the Novi Sad railway station, carried out by Serbian Railway Infrastructure, the Serbian state, China Railway International Co. Ltd., and China Communications Construction Company Ltd., which began the station's construction in 2021. The other demands are the dismissal of all charges against arrested and detained students and young protesters who have been demonstrating since the canopy collapsed; the filing of criminal charges and the prosecution of those responsible for the attacks on students and professors; and a 20 percent increase in budget allocations for public higher-education institutions in Serbia to cover material expenses.

Since November, students have organized massive strikes, with such protests as a gathering of over 100,000 people at Belgrade's Slavija Square on December 22. The protests continued into the New Year, with demonstrators declaring there was nothing to "celebrate" until justice was achieved. They demonstrations are still ongoing, having recently forced the resignations of prime minister Milos Vučević and Novi Sad's mayor Milan Đurić on January 28.

Students have held assemblies and effectively conveyed their message to the media. With a keen sense for Instagramable moments, they have gracefully steered social media campaigns, often featuring overhead drone footage of the protests and eye-catching visuals. Their actions have not only challenged state power, but their demands — particularly for criminal charges and prosecution — offer a stark critique of the deeper systemic rot: a corrupt judicial system that upholds a mafia state and a government that not only fails its people but is complicit in their deaths.

What began as a response in Serbia's major cities has now evolved into a

nationwide movement, spreading to smaller towns as well. As noted by Novi Sad activist and scholar Aleksandar Matković on X/Twitter, a map of Serbia showing protests happening across almost all municipalities nationwide shows that the situation is likely to escalate into either a government crisis or more conflict.

The events have also sparked deep cultural anxieties tied to national identity. This Monday, the Serbian Orthodox Church published an article damning the student protests, asserting that they were pushing an "anti-Saint Sava, anti-Christian and anti-Serbian narrative and way of life." This claim that students live in a "parallel universe" was walked back in a statement on Tuesday, which clarified that the text did not reflect the stance of the Church's top cleric, Patriarch Porfirije.

Recently, the protests have intensified into violence, with protesters engaging in fierce clashes with supporters of the ruling SNS party. On Tuesday night at around 3:00 a.m., a group of SNS supporters launched an attack on students in Novi Sad. Many Serbians were especially shocked by a series of interviews widely covered in media in which SNS supporters from the city of Jagodina denounced the students. One older man even said that he would welcome attacks on his daughter if she were protesting.

Nationalists and Multinationals

This is a moment of growing interest in the power of mass movements to drive political change. Following Donald Trump's return to the US presidency, obsessive media coverage often frames one man's corruption and venality as redeemed by his inauguration as head of state. The parallels to Vučić are striking,

particularly since Trump and his son-in-law Jared Kushner recently finalized a business deal to build a Trump-branded luxury hotel on the site of the former Yugoslav Ministry of Defense in Belgrade. This site, bombed by NATO in 1999, long stood as a symbol of the bombing and the dangers represented by this alliance.

Today the Kushner deal, brokered with real estate agents in Abu Dhabi, reflects a broader picture around the Balkans: real estate developments treated as megadeals between state and business leaders from the United States, European Union, China, and beyond. Such arrangements ultimately benefit only very few but are covered by judicial protection. In stark contrast, the student demands — focused on strengthening education and creating institutions that genuinely serve the people, as well as restoring legitimacy to the state prosecutor — directly challenge the interests of autocrats and the capitalist developers whom they protect.

Much Western media coverage of the Novi Sad deaths and resulting protests has been inaccurate, emphasizing Serbia's strong ties to Russia and implying that the student protests follow a Maidan-like, anti-Russian tradition. While this framing may be intended to attract attention to the protests, it is misleading about what is really at stake. The concern here isn't foreign interference in another state's affairs but rather domestic corruption, crime, and the fundamental question of what and whom the state is truly serving.

Analysts like political scientist Florian Bieber, who emphasizes the need to align the resistance with Serbia's opposition parties, overlook the fact that such challenges are not unique to Serbia but are part of a broader global

crisis of governance in which capturing electoral victory cannot be the only aim of politics. As the late theorist Fredric Jameson noted, we are witnessing a global erosion of state power. Jameson instead called for a "dual power" in which alternative structures emerge to fulfill essential functions that the state has failed to provide. The student protests reflect this idea in practice, through soup kitchens, self-defense networks, and other forms of collective support. They are not just demanding change but actively demonstrating what a self-sustaining, community-driven alternative could look like.

Collapse

Many outcomes were possible after this incident. The business dealings between the Serbian state and China risked fueling xenophobia toward Serbia's significant Chinese population. The collapse could have been forgotten as an isolated tragedy. Instead, Serbian students have demonstrated that it is possible to challenge corrupt systems. Success depends on our ability to embrace the potential of new and emerging forms of social cohesion.

Serbian student movements have led change before. In 1968, they won concessions from Josip Broz Tito, who acknowledged the validity of many of their economic and political demands. President Vučić may sometimes present himself as Tito's successor, but he only offers empty promises, failing to implement real changes. In 2000, president Slobodan Milošević was overthrown after a three-year internal struggle sparked by the student-led Otpor! movement.

More recently, protests against the Serbian government's support for the British-based multinational Rio Tinto's

lithium mining project — ignoring well-documented environmental risks — have highlighted the growing resistance to state-backed corporate exploitation. In 2022, widespread public pressure ultimately forced a U-turn on allowing the company into the country. This incident further underscores how nationalist rhetoric often masks collusion with foreign corporate interests, prioritizing economic deals over public welfare. The current student protests have built on this momentum, digging deeper into these contradictions and challenging entrenched networks of political and economic power.

The Novi Sad station canopy is a grotesque metaphor for the uncertainty facing Serbia. First created in 1964, it symbolizes a time when the Yugoslav state was thriving and modernizing — an era of ambitious infrastructure projects and social progress. But its neglectful maintenance and ultimate collapse serve as stark reminders of Vučić's inability to carry on such a legacy in substance. While he postures as a strong leader, his governance has been marked by economic inequality, political repression, and a failure to invest in the institutions and public goods that once defined Yugoslavia's vision of collective progress.

The students in the streets today are not just protesting an isolated incident; they are confronting a system that has long prioritized political survival over public well-being. If they succeed, they may finally break this cycle and push Serbia toward a future where the state truly works for its people. If they fail, the collapse of the canopy may serve as a chilling warning of further decay to come. Now we can only hope that they succeed.

[Jacobin](#) 1 February 2025

Belgium: Massive demonstration against the federal government

16 February 2025, by [LCR-SAP](#)

This major mobilisation should be a first test of strength, and mark the start of a real plan of action against the government in the coming weeks. The union leaders have announced a general strike for 31 March. This will be a decisive step in the balance of power, but before that, we need to continue mobilising, sector by sector: railway workers, Audi subcontractors and teachers have already announced strikes and actions, and these are the embers of a broader mobilisation. The feminist strike on 8 March should also be part of this fight against Arizona, showing the particularly harmful impact of its measures on women, and linking feminist and trade union issues. Similarly, actions on 21 March, the International Day Against Racism, should denounce the new government's murderous immigration policy. As for the general strike, it will only be effective if it is supported by a broad popular mobilisation from below, going beyond a simple 24-hour work stoppage. The protest movement must continue to spread from now on, and above all be deployed with a clear objective: the fall of the De Wever government.

No to the demolition of our rights! Unite to stop Arizona!

The world is tilting towards the far

right, which is destroying society and the planet for profit. With De Wever - Bouchez, Belgium is heading in the same direction. It's time to fight for a different kind of society. Generous, inclusive, welcoming, democratic and social.

The De Wever government represents an historic danger for the world of work and its organisations. Together with the European Union, it is manipulating the issue of public debt in order to carry out a large-scale offensive against the social conquests of the working class: in concrete terms, its programme means the end of genuine social security in the event of unemployment, pension or illness. Wage indexation is under threat, as is protection against unbearable working hours. These measures come on top of decades of austerity and are aimed at decisively weakening the position of workers vis-à-vis employers.

At all levels, it is primarily women who will pay the highest price. In the face of climate danger, Arizona is the government of deadly denial. The inhuman repression of exiled workers, migrants and asylum seekers is aimed at fracturing the resistance of our class through the poison of racism: attacks on trade union freedoms and the rights to strike and demonstrate complete this project to muzzle us. Their blah-blah about the 'lesser evil' and 'social dialogue' are nothing but decoys. Let's not make the same mistakes as in 2014!

We need to change course. A course that aims for clarity:

- No illusions in a 'better balance' with Arizona: it's time to put an end to austerity on the backs of workers and their Social Security, and to the destruction of the Earth!
- No to meaningless 'social dialogue': for real democratic control over our living, working and pay conditions!
- Out with the false 'political friends' who betray us: let's defend our demands ourselves!
- We want to and can go and find the money where it is, by introducing a real crisis tax on the ultra-rich: an exceptional, substantial and progressive tax on the wealth of the country's richest 10%.
- We need a real plan of action, building from the bottom up, leading to a real general strike at the end, with the aim of bringing down the government!
- There's no time to lose: the EU expects concrete reforms by the end of April!
- Let's get everyone involved in the struggle, by forming action committees across companies and sectors!
- For a broad alliance of trade unions and social movements in defence of another society based on solidarity and democracy!

WE HAVE NO TIME TO LOSE! STOP ARIZONA!

inprecor-><https://inprecor.fr/node/4580>] 15 February 2025

Trumps' first days in power: Is the US heading toward fascism?

15 February 2025, by [Kay Mann](#)

As promised and expected most of these -and those to come-are attacks on immigrants, LGBTQI+ people, women, existing environmental protection laws, communities of color, and labor and progressive organizations, while sending messages that the 1% will enjoy tax cuts and face far fewer worker safety and environmental protection regulations.

Some seemed to be designed in part to test the limits of his allies fealty and state institutions, like his pardoning and sentence commuting of all of the January 6 insurrectionists, including those convicted of violent attacks against the police officers defending the capitol.

It should be clear that Trump is a right wing, would-be dictator and intends to

expand presidential power as far he can. But the blatantly authoritarian, far-right orientation of Trump and his collaborators shouldn't obscure the ways that Trump's government both adheres to and breaks with contemporary capitalist ideology and practice. Indeed, the line between conservative capitalist politics and fascism is not always clear. Trumps'

hostility to environmental, labor, and consumer rights protections and guidelines put him squarely within the free-market neo-liberal order.

Indeed, within the first 24 hours of his presidency, Trump cancelled scores of regulations, and inspectors generals, who are responsible for enforcing government regulations were replaced with Trump loyalists. All federal DEI officers were put on leave as a prelude to their positions and jobs being eliminated. Trump withdrew the US from the World Health Organization, and the Paris Climate change accords and sent clear green lights for increased oil exploration. Trump's attack on immigrants and promises to deport them have been a hallmark of his program since his first presidency when he promised to build a wall along the US/Mexican border to deter immigration. It should be remembered that inhumane treatment of refugees has been carried out by right wing and social democratic governments in Europe and elsewhere, and Obama's government deported more immigrants than that of his predecessor, conservative Republican George W. Bush.

At the same time, Trump's loudly proclaimed protectionism and threats to put tariffs of up to 25% on imported goods from Mexico and China, puts him at odds with neo-liberal free trade. The contradiction reflects an aggressive, take-no-prisoners capitalism vis-a-vis allies, long seen by US presidents and the two parties as partners, but now seen as competitors. Protectionism, economic nationalism, and jingoism have always marched together but Trump's vision takes this much further and in ways aimed to remake the international capitalist order to favor the US even more.

This also explains the seeming contradiction between Trump's isolationist bent and his threats to use military force, a new version of Realpolitik. US presidents have long chosen captains of financial and industrial capital as advisors and officials, but Trump has surrounded himself with a large coterie of ultra rich capitalists like Elon Musk, the richest man in the world (who recently addressed Germany's fascist AfD party,

declaring it to be Germany "best hope"), Mark Zuckerberg, and Jeff Bezos, three of the richest people in the world, with Musk in an official role. As the owners of Twitter and Facebook, Musk and Zuckerberg control huge swaths of social media and information. Their proximity to the world's most powerful man, with dictatorial tendencies has enormous anti-democratic implications.

A fascist?

Much of Trump's program and first steps in this presidency resembles therefore classic conservative and even liberal governments, though often to the extreme. In what sense, then can they be seen as fascist? Firstly, fascist and far right authoritarian regimes greatly expand the scope of executive power and eradicate checks on that power, turning parliaments into rubber stamps. Likewise, they seek to eliminate legal and political opposition. Among Trump's first moves has been a purge of civil service to ensure that government personnel will be politically committed to Trump's agenda. While there is no sign of Trump moving to ban the opposition Democratic Party, threats to prosecute and jail members of the congressional January 6 committee, all Democrats, could be first step in that direction. Among Biden's last official acts as president was to give likely targets of political persecution preemptive pardons to shield them from Trump's wrath. This is unprecedented in US political history.

Secondly, fascist regimes suspend or sharply curtail civil and political rights including those of free speech, the press, and assembly. If Trump's threats against the press and critical journalists escalate beyond verbal threats, this too would place Trump in the authoritarian/fascist camp. Trump's feud with former Chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, General Mark Miley arose from the former's refusal to use troops against peaceful Black Lives Matter protestors. If Trump were to use violence and mass repression against protestors, he would clearly be making a step towards authoritarianism and fascism.

A colossus with clay feet

Trump, a lumpen capitalist and reality TV star cum 45th president, twice impeached, indicted and convicted, and finally reelected, becoming the undisputed caudillo of the Republican party may seem invincible now. But like all would-be dictators, Trump will turn out to be a colossus with clay feet. His congressional majority is razor thin and while the Republican party leadership has mostly caved in, there are still untamed holdouts that will slow his agenda.

This was seen in the vote to confirm Trump's ultra-reactionary choice for Secretary of the Defense, Pete Hegseth. Three Republicans voted against him resulting in a tie that was only broken in favor of conformation by Vance as the Speaker of the House. While Trump stacked the federal judiciary including the Supreme Court with ultra conservative supports, the court have far from being an across the board rubber stamp. A conservative federal judge appointed by Reagan slapped down Trump's pronunciamiento ending birthright citizenship as blatantly unconstitutional. Many of Trump's most fervent supporters are strongly anti-abortion. But Trump, recognizing how many Republicans are pro-choice, tries to play it both sides by taking credit for overturning Roe v. Wade but refuses to commit to a federal abortion ban, calling instead for the reproductive right be decided at the state level. But Trump can't evade the issue for long and will inevitably encounter the opposition of one side or the other, if not both.

The high price of daily life necessities under Biden was a main reason that Trump won. When the cost of living fails to improve and is aggravated by Trump's tariffs, much of his support among workers and middle class voters will lessen. Alarming numbers of Latino/as and Blacks voted for Trump in 2024. Attacks against DEI and affirmative action, the strengthening of the carceral and repressive apparatus of the state will eventually lay bare those contradictions. When Trump fails to

make good on his promises to bring about general prosperity the midterm congressional elections scheduled for November 2026 may well see Trump lose his Republican majority in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which would represent a blow to his ambitions, but also gives him and his advisors incentive to move quickly.

Ultimately, Trumpism, fascism, and the capitalist system that makes Trump possible will only be defeated by the mass mobilization and unity of workers and the oppressed independent of the Democrat and Republican parties. While the elections seem to reflect despair and

division among these, the recent history of mass anti-racist struggle and militant labor struggles seen during the BLM protests in 2020 and impressive labor struggles by auto workers, teachers and others, point the way forward underscore the potential for a united fightback.

[Inprecor](#) 26.1.2025

Lethal Trumpery in Africa

14 February 2025, by [Paul Martial](#)

“Radical madmen” is what Trump thinks of the leaders of USAID (the United States Agency for International Development), whose activities he has just frozen for 90 days. His sidekick Elon Musk compares the structure set up by Kennedy in 1961 with a “criminal organization”. The development agency’s staff have been laid off, those working abroad must return to Washington by the end of the month and most of the local staff have been dismissed.

Millions of potential victims

The future of USAID is uncertain, with most observers betting on its integration into the State Department (the equivalent of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), thus putting an end to the broad autonomy enjoyed by the organization.

With a fund of more than 40 billion dollars, the main beneficiary is not Africa, which comes only in second place, but Europe, with aid to Ukraine

amounting to 17 billion dollars for projects to support the economy and institutions.

In 2023, Africa received more than 15 billion dollars for two important areas, emergency aid and health. The sudden and unannounced cut endangers the lives of millions of people by depriving them of their medicines, particularly antivirals for the treatment of HIV.

This freeze also weakens health prevention structures, both the early warning systems against epidemics and the logistics for the distribution of vaccines. This weakening is all the more worrying as it coincides with the withdrawal of the United States from the WHO (World Health Organisation).

An unjust order

Many people in the United States consider this measure to be harmful, especially for American politics, which risks suffering negative effects, whether in terms of the reliability of the country’s commitments or the weakening of its soft power and its

power to exert pressure. This is certainly true. But this measure illustrates above all and tragically that if the rich countries’ development aid policies exist, it is because these same rich countries impose structural adjustment policies that persist under other names, taking advantage of the international division of labour to plunder the resources of so-called poor countries with the complicity of local potentates.

The desire to dismantle USAID, coupled with the reduction in European countries’ development aid policies - remember that the Netherlands is going to reduce its allocation by 9 billion dollars over the next four years, and the 2025 budgets of France and Germany are decreasing by 2 billion and 1.7 billion dollars respectively - demonstrate that the solution does not lie in dependence on aid but in a struggle for a fundamental change in the world order. A struggle truly of... “radical madmen”.

*Translated by **International Viewpoint** from **l’Anticapitaliste**. 13 February 2025*

Ukraine three years after all-out invasion: Continue solidarity and support

13 February 2025, by [Fred Leplat](#), [Liz Lawrence](#)

The current phase of the war in Ukraine started on the 24 February 2022, three years ago. Russia invaded

and annexed Crimea in 2014, and then attempted for eight years to annex the Donbass. When Putin ordered the

large-scale imperialist invasion in February 2024 to “demilitarise” and “denazify” Ukraine, he believed that

the Zelenskyy government would fall within a matter of days and that Russian troops would be welcomed. But the Russian troops were pushed back, and three years on, victory for Putin, or at least achieving his war aims, is nowhere near.

For the Ukrainians, their motivation to continue the war remains the same: the liberation of their country from occupation and restoring self-determination. Their resistance to imperialist aggression and for independence is entirely legitimate, as well as is obtaining the arms from wherever they can. Occupation and annexation are crimes, whether they happen in Ukraine or Palestine. Ukrainians voted decisively for independence in 1991 (at the time of the end of the Soviet Union) in the referendum, with 92% voting in favour, on an 84% turnout.

Casualties on both sides during the last three years have been **extremely high**. The Russians may have lost over 200,000 killed and 600,000 wounded, while Ukraine has lost over 80,000 dead and 400,000 wounded. In addition, over 12,000 Ukrainian civilians have died, with 30,000 wounded. Despite exhaustion from the war, **4 in 10** Ukrainians still want the war to continue until victory, while understandably, half want war to end as soon as possible. Ukraine is a nation with a long history, with its own language and culture. Like for Palestinians and other oppressed peoples, the sentiment for independence, national sovereignty and self-determination goes back a long way.

After three years of this phase of the war, Ukraine is in a difficult position. Russia has stepped up its bombing of civilian areas and infrastructure, and is making slow but steady military advances. Western sanctions against Russia have not hit its economy significantly, and its export of **liquified natural gas** is at a record high. However, there are strains now emerging in the Russian economy as a result of the war. After a period when the war actually seemed to be benefiting Russia economically (so-called 'military Keynesianism') it has now encountered serious resource constraints and increasing inflation. If

significant economic problems arise in Russia, this would strengthen the Ukrainian position in any negotiations.

The financial pressure from Trump is dangerous for Ukraine. Biden, before leaving office, committed the US to **\$5.9 billion in military and budget aid**, but Trump may renew this only as a loan if Ukraine agrees to negotiations with Russia in which it **makes concessions**. After pausing arms supplies for a few days, Trump has suggested aid may continue in exchange for Ukraine supplying the US with **rare earth metals**. Trump's pause in **USAid** will also affect Ukraine hard: since February 2022, it has received \$7.6bn in humanitarian aid from the US.

In Ukraine the war effort is being hit by war-weariness, more difficulty recruiting and the increase in desertions. But more critical is that the government has not instituted a "war economy" with decisive state intervention in critical sectors, from arms manufacture to health and housing. Instead, it has embraced **neoliberalism** with privatisations and attacks on employment rights. The **latest attack** on union and labour rights has been pushed back, but the threat remains. Zelensky wants to prove his neoliberal credentials, in particular with his refusal **to call for the debt of Ukraine be cancelled**. He wants to be a reliable partner with private investors and banks. Cancellation of the debt is crucial to enable a socially just reconstruction. Privatisations have enabled the enrichment of a few and spread corruption, which in turn has damaged morale and trust.

Putin clearly believes that Ukraine will be forced into accepting an imposed "peace" settlement negotiated with Trump behind the backs of the Ukrainians. In a sign that Putin cannot win the war for now, the original war objectives have been watered down. In addition to the annexation of the Donbass, Putin wants Ukraine to reduce its military by 80% and stay out of the EU and NATO. Despite Zelensky conceding negotiating directly with Putin, **this has been rejected by Putin**, who claims that Zelensky is not legitimate as his term expired and no new elections have

been held during wartime. So the Ukrainians have little choice but to fight on and resist as best they can the Russian invasion, the purpose of which is to turn their country into a satellite of Russia.

The war has dragged on because Ukraine has not received weapons in sufficient quantity or quickly enough to defend itself. Western imperialism has always been ambivalent in its support for Ukraine. Some countries would like to see the war end as soon as possible so that "normal" business can resume with Russia, while others would like the war to drag on as long as possible so as to weaken Russian imperialism. The West reluctantly supported Ukraine in the name of "defending democracy". This had the benefit of giving NATO and Western imperialist countries a new coat of paint after their 20-year "war against terrorism" ended in defeat in Afghanistan and Iraq. Their lukewarm support for Ukraine is in stark contrast with their support for **genocidal actions of Israel in Gaza** and the brutal dictatorship of the House of Saud, providing both of them with an unlimited supply of weapons. Ukraine is of limited geostrategic interest to the West compared to Israel and Saudi Arabia.

White Banner: From Ukraine to Palestine Occupation is a Crime with the respecyive flags painted above the country names being carried by 5 or 6 people at front of photo with other people and banners further back Labour leader Keir Starmer has continued the Tory government's cautious support for Ukraine, carefully avoiding supporting its war aims - the liberation of the country. He only says that Ukraine should be "in the strongest possible position in the coming months" so that any peace deal to end its war with Ukraine "could be achieved through strength". While he declares that Britain is "standing by Ukraine", **he drags his feet supplying weapons**, but **recommits Britain to increased military spending**. While supporting Ukraine, **some on the left** have latched on to NATO's new mission in their belief that Russian imperialism is the gravest danger facing Western democracies, therefore backing Labour's increases in military budgets.

But the West can give Ukraine what it needs without increasing such spending.

The Ukrainians should be supported in their resistance against Russian imperialist invasion despite Zelensky's neoliberal government. They should also be supported in spite of Western imperialism trying to influence the war aims and the future of Ukraine. The West is using the war to weaken a rival imperialist country, Russia, and ensure a neoliberal reconstruction. For the West, this is more important than the liberation of Ukraine. The neoliberal course of the Zelensky government has to be condemned, and illusions by Ukrainians in the European Union be dispelled. The

“structural adjustment” applied by the EU and the European Central Bank on Greece in 2015 for a bail-out of its debt is a lesson for Ukraine. There was an alternative then, and there is an alternative now in Ukraine to extreme neoliberalism. It will come from the left, the trade unions and progressive forces in Ukraine, with international solidarity, fighting for a cancellation of the country's debt and for a reconstruction based on social, economic and climate justice.

Internationally, supporters of Ukraine must continue solidarity work. This includes education about the oppression being suffered by Ukrainians in territory under Russian occupation. We must challenge any view that the sufferings of Ukrainians

will end if they are forced to stop fighting and to surrender. Trump's plans to allow Putin to annex around 20% of Ukraine will not provide the basis for a long-term settlement to the war. They may lay the basis for further invasion and annexation. In addition to demanding the withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukraine, we must raise demands for return of all Ukrainian prisoners of war and Ukrainian civilians who have been forcibly removed to Russian territory. We must oppose peace talks being held without Ukrainians present or any imposition of a settlement against the will of the Ukrainian people.

[AntiCapitalist Resistance](#) 10 February 2025

Trumps nightmare for Gaza based on longstanding Zionist hope

12 February 2025

Donald Trump's proposal to remove all Palestinians from Gaza and turn the region into a beach resort has received near global condemnation. The objections have pointed out, correctly, that this idea is both outrageous and impractical; but they generally ignore the fact that it does not originate from Trump, but has long been a part of Zionist plans for the Middle East.

Theodor Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement, was initially unclear whether his future Jewish state should be in Palestine or in Argentina. He confided to his diary in June 1895, regarding the indigenous inhabitants of such a state “We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our country”. Prior to expulsion, he proposed that “If we move into a region where there are wild animals to which the Jews are not accustomed—big snakes, etc.—I shall use the natives, prior to giving them employment in the transit countries, for the extermination of these

animals.”

Under Ottoman, and from 1917 British, rule the Zionist movement evicted thousands of peasants from their lands. Yosef Weitz, director of the colonising body the Jewish National Fund and one of the architects of this policy, wrote in 1940 (again in his diary, and not intended for publication) “It should be clear to us that there is no room in Palestine for these two peoples... The only solution is Palestine, at least Western Palestine, without Arabs... The way is to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries, all of them, except perhaps those from Bethlehem, Nazareth and the Old City of Jerusalem. Not one village, not one tribe should be left”.

The wars that established the state of Israel in 1947-9 created the opportunity to forcibly remove Palestinians not just from their homes, but from Palestine itself. In the course of these wars, some 750,000 Palestinians — about 80% of the total population — was “spirited across the border”, accompanied by countless

massacres and atrocities. One of the most notorious of these was the July 1948 massacre in Lydd, where scores of Palestinians died after they were imprisoned in a mosque which was then shelled by an Israeli tank. About 70,000 survivors were then forced to walk through the desert towards Ramallah; hundreds died in what became known as the Lydda Death March. The officer who gave the order for these crimes was Yitzhak Rabin, later hailed by many as a hero of “liberal Zionism”.

Another Israeli unaccountably regarded as a “liberal Zionist” is historian Benny Morris, who in an interview with Haaretz in 2004 criticised Israel's first prime minister David Ben-Gurion for not going far enough: “If the end of the story turns out to be a gloomy one for the Jews, it will be because Ben-Gurion did not complete the transfer in 1948. Because he left a large and volatile demographic reserve in the West Bank and Gaza and within Israel itself... The non-completion of the transfer was a mistake.”

A later opportunity came in 1967, when Israel occupied the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem, and expelled a further 300,000 Palestinians. Israel's Chief of Staff responsible for this was, once again, Yitzhak Rabin.

Since 1967, Israel has expelled many hundreds, if not thousands, of Palestinians, while the establishment of illegal settlements has deprived very many more of their homes and land. Although associated with the so-called Zionist right, much of this activity originated with and has been carried out by people professing to be

liberal or even socialist Zionists. While the open fascists, such as Finance Minister Bezalel Smotrich and former National Security Minister Itamar Ben-Gvir, publicly proclaim their desire to remove all Palestinians from Palestine, others have been quietly pursuing the same agenda while publicly dissociating themselves from the idea of forcible expulsion.

Trump's proposal, therefore, is not as outlandish as it may at first seem. Much of the ground for this has been established over the past 77 years of dispossession and expulsion. Any attempt to implement it will meet with

mass Palestinian resistance, which will be supported by consistent anti imperialists in Israel - but it seems unlikely that a significant number of Israeli Jews would take any steps to prevent this further crime against humanity.

We insist that if Palestinians in Gaza are to be resettled, it should be to their former homes, towns and villages in Palestine, from which they have been excluded for many decades.

[AntiCapitalist Resistance](#). 9 February 2025

Flooding in Rennes, the weather to blame?

11 February 2025, by [NPA Rennes](#)

Several streets near the Ille-et-Rance canal have been seriously affected, and hundreds of residents have been evacuated to Red Cross shelters. Guipry-Messac is also under water, with record flooding, and Redon is set to receive the flood wave from the whole catchment area by the weekend. The NPA Rennes naturally expresses its complete solidarity with those affected and salutes the commitment of the SDIS 35 and all the personnel mobilised to respond to this... 'natural' disaster? Well, not quite.

Rapid urbanisation in flood-prone areas

For some years now, Rennes has been experiencing galloping urbanisation. You wouldn't have to be a rocket scientist to guess that some plots of land would be easily submerged by the first heavy rains. On the outskirts of the Saint-Martin meadows, in the Confluence district... new buildings are springing up and the cranes are still working.

With 10,000 more inhabitants since 2015, due to an increase in the natural balance but above all to a massive

influx of new residents linked closely to the high-speed train line, the municipality is building like crazy. The current Local Housing Plan calls for an additional 30,000 homes to be built between 2023 and 2028, more than half of which will be in the heart of the city. Between 2011 and 2017, 188 hectares of land were artificially developed.

With the city's topography leaving little choice, construction is taking place in flood-prone areas close to the Vilaine and canals. These land requirements are a boon to the region's property developers (Giboire) and concrete companies (Lafarge).

Destruction of hedgerows

This land artificialisation and concrete development is widely supported by the municipality and by Rennes Métropole through its projects at La Prévalaye, Via Silva and the extension and even construction of a new football stadium. With the destruction of this arable land, these hedgerows, these small hectares of hedged farmland on the edge of the metropolis, an entire ecosystem that retains rainwater is destroyed every

year by the municipal team and the developers.

The poorest pay the price

Unprecedented climatic episodes of this kind will multiply over the next few years in the face of political inaction and the headlong rush of capitalism and the governments that serve it. In 2020, the European Environment Agency already announced: 'In this most optimistic scenario, on the west coast of France, the risk of flooding will be almost 200 times greater than in 2010'. And in Rennes, as everywhere else in the world, the bill is being paid by the most vulnerable sections of the population, while property developers, concrete companies and insurance companies are profiting from these crises.

The floods in Rennes are not the result of 'bad luck'; they are the result of capitalist spatial planning. Development must be based on the environment, not on profits. To reduce flooding, it is also essential to limit global warming as much as possible through an eco-socialist reduction in production. Is the whole of Rennes sinking? It's up to us to flood the capitalist system!

Trump-Musk Coup Leads to Resistance in the Courts and in the Streets

10 February 2025, by [Dan La Botz](#)

At the same time though, only a month into his second term as president, Trump has galvanized a resistance in both the courts and on the streets. The resistance, still small and inchoate, is beginning to take on the characteristic of a mass popular movement.

Lawsuits brought in the federal courts have at least temporarily stopped Trump from carrying out all of his executive orders. A federal court stopped Trump from freezing billions of dollars in grants and loans. Another stopped Musk and his Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) from accessing Treasury Department records. Yet another court has blocked Trump's attempt to force federal employees into retirement. A court has also stopped him from ending birth-right citizenship. In some of these cases, Trump and Musk have failed to abide by court orders. Still the number of suits grows as students sue to stop DOGE's takeover of the Education Department and unions bring suits to protect federal workers' jobs.

Meanwhile tens of millions of Americans, 1,500 per minute, have

been calling their representatives in Congress, completely overwhelming the congressional telephone system. They call to complain that their government jobs are threatened, that they have not received payments to their NGO, their company, or themselves, or calls simply to decry what Trump and Musk are doing to the country.

Out in the streets, tens of thousands protest Trump's executive orders in cities across the country. Organized by a pop-up movement called 50501, meaning 50 demonstrations in 50 cities on one day. The protests, many of them at the state capitals, took place in at least 40 states, both Republican and Democratic, varying in size from a handful, to hundreds, to thousands and taking up a wide variety of particular issues, but also the big issue of attempt to impose an authoritarian oligarchic government that ignores democratic institutions. In one of the demonstrations a woman carried a sign that read, "This is a coup: Clash, Don't Collaborate!"

In the largest demonstrations so far, thousands marched in Los Angeles to protest Trump's deporting of

immigrants, blocking streets and briefly paralyzing a major freeway. In New York City, thousands, among them a number of non-binary children and adolescents, gathered in Union Square to protest Trump's attack on gender affirming care for trans children.

Some of these protests have been led by Democratic Party politicians, such as Senator Elizabeth Warren who headed up a group of legislators, federal employees, and common citizens demonstrating at the Treasury Department. Democratic lawmakers and government employees also led another in Washington, D.C. to protest the closing of USAID, the American aid and development agency.

Protestors of all ages, all genders, and all ethnicities carry signs reading: "Stop Musk." "Stop Project 2025" (the Republican program) "Stop the Coup" and "Stop Fascism." Others carried signs that said, "Christians, Love Thy Neighbor." In some demonstrations protestors flew the American flag, the LGBTQ rainbow flag, the Mexican flag and the Palestinian flag. Will this become a movement of millions?

Palestine: In Gaza and the West Bank, the ceasefire does not stop Israel's colonial machine

9 February 2025, by [Theo](#)

For the mainstream media, there are, on the one hand, the Israeli 'hostages' who are much talked about and, on the other, the Palestinian prisoners who are called 'terrorists'. They don't really know the term 'political prisoners' or 'imprisoned children'. Nor do they know anything about the conditions of detention: often

imprisoned without trial, by administrative decision, hostages to a practice inherited from British colonialism and perpetuated by Israeli colonialism, mistreated, tortured, sometimes killed or killed in prison.

Israel continues in the West Bank

The hypocrisy and cynicism of Israel and its allies know no bounds. At the same time as the Zionist state is signing the ceasefire for Gaza, it is

deploying even more of its army in the West Bank. In the occupied territories, the Palestinians are suffering, at an intensified pace, the violence of fascist settlers accompanied by the repression and brutality of the Israeli army. The reports we hear from journalists are terrifying. As for our friends in the West Bank, they tell us about the prevailing fear but also ask us to continue our solidarity actions. Hundreds of new checkpoints are being set up at the entrances to towns, villages and refugee camps. They are closing off all access and turning the West Bank into a mousetrap. Arrests of Palestinians of all ages have become massive.

Jenin, one of the bastions of Palestinian resistance, is under attack: bombings, destruction of roads and infrastructure, demolition of homes, forced displacement and massacres of the inhabitants. Trump has lifted

financial sanctions against the most virulent settlers in the West Bank and is calling on Egypt and Jordan to take in Gazans.

Israel's right to flout international law

This is a serious time. If Israel, with the active help of the United States and the complicity of Western countries and certain Arab countries, pursues its plan to annex what remains of the Palestinian territories, after the genocide in Gaza, a new and even more dramatic Nakba is in the offing.

This situation will continue to be treated by the mainstream media, the government and Europe as Israel's

perpetual 'right' to defend itself with impunity, in other words as an apartheid colonial state that flouts international law and UN resolutions. And ignores the decisions of the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice.

Only the Palestinian resistance, together with international solidarity, can stop Israel and the United States. Let's continue to mobilise and put pressure on governments, let's step up the campaign to boycott Israel, its products and the companies that are complicit. Let's step up solidarity with the Palestinian people for their right to resistance, for their right to remain on or return to their land, for their right to life, freedom and justice. Let's broaden our solidarity so that the massacres, genocide, occupation and colonisation stop.

[L'Anticapitaliste](#) 30 January 2025

Leonidas Iza: "Elections are an extension of the people's struggle"

8 February 2025, by [Iain Bruce](#), [Leonadis Iza](#)

Iza reflects on the impact of the demonstrations on the electoral situation and the need to build a political project from the grassroots, defending plurinationality, the public sector and national sovereignty. He also addresses the tensions and challenges of the Ecuadorian left, the role of the Citizen Revolution and its strategy for the elections.

Faced with a political scenario dominated by the right, the rise of drug trafficking and the fragmentation of progressive forces, the Indigenous leader is committed to an alternative that does not abandon street protests, but rather integrates the electoral dispute as part of a broader social and political struggle to transform Ecuador.

IAIN BRUCE: Over the last year, Ecuador has faced a series of difficult situations - rising levels of gang violence and state repression, drought and an

electricity crisis, deepening poverty and mass migration. Could you describe what the context of the country was like at the start of this campaign, a little over a year after Daniel Noboa became president?

LEONIDAS IZA: Since the idea of an 'overweight state' and excessive bureaucracy was introduced, the model imposed by the International Monetary Fund — successively implemented by the Moreno, Lasso and now Noboa governments — has resulted in a fragile state, lacking in social policies to strengthen key sectors of the Ecuadorean economy and society. Education, health and employment have been seriously neglected, as has support for the grassroots and solidarity economy. This has led to a drastic deterioration in the living conditions of ordinary Ecuadoreans.

As a consequence, in the most

impoverished areas, many have ended up seeing drug trafficking, organised crime or illegal activities as their only way out. For the majority of Ecuadoreans, this represents a problem, but for the political and economic elites, for the oligarchies, it is an opportunity: they have exploited this suffering to promote their usual projects.

We now find ourselves in a painful situation. After President Noboa's declaration of a 'state of war', which is now a year old, these elites have managed to establish a hegemony in public thought and discussion. The so-called Phoenix Plan, to tackle gang-related violence, does not really exist and there any real intention to put an end to the lack of security; what we are seeing is the use of this crisis as a mechanism of control.

In economic terms, the declaration of war has hit the country hard. It has scared off investment and has affected

strategic sectors such as tourism, which has declined both on the coast and in the highlands and the Amazon. Furthermore, due to the energy crisis, we have recorded losses of more than 8 billion dollars, according to estimates by the business groups concerned.

On the other hand, we are experiencing a serious violation of human rights. Cases such as that of the four children in Maldivas (where four afro-Ecuadorean boys were detained by the army and later found dead) are just one example of a systematic policy. It is estimated that, under the state of war, more than 20,000 young people have been prosecuted, but the data indicates that only between 350 and 500 of them had any real involvement in illegal activities. What happened to the rest? We don't know.

Added to this is a climate of structural racism. In Ecuadorean society today, if a white or mestizo person sees someone of African descent, they assume they are a criminal; if they see an Indigenous person, they label them a terrorist and a 'Quito arsonist' (in reference to the Indigenous-led uprisings of 2019 and 2022); if they see a poor person, they stigmatise and racialise them. This is the scenario that the Ecuadorean right has been able to take advantage of, and it is one that we have to confront.

Today we face systematic violations of human rights, a State that operates with a monarchical logic, the breakdown of the basic conditions for democratic coexistence and the failure to comply with the Constitution and the Code of Democracy. The four branches of government have subordinated themselves to the Executive, and the latter, in turn, is subject to the conditions imposed by the International Monetary Fund.

In the last year, Ecuador has agreed to a new loan of 5.5 billion dollars, not yet disbursed, but destined exclusively to pay previous debt. Meanwhile, the economic and political elites continue to control the national scene, deepening a crisis that increasingly affects the majority of the Ecuadorean people.

IB: Last month there was a major mobilisation in the Amazon against the construction of a super prison. Do you think this marks a reactivation of the social movement after the impact of Noboa's security policy? And, in that sense, do you think this has influenced the campaign, generating a new political climate?

LI: Look, Ecuadorians are, by nature, a fighting people. Throughout history, all governments have tried to curb this rebelliousness and dismantle organisational processes in different ways: criminalising and persecuting leaders, inventing parallel organisations or trying to link us to organised crime and drug trafficking. We have seen these strategies time and time again. But popular resistance is stronger, and they will never succeed in breaking it.

When we have mobilised, we have done so forcefully, as happened in 2019 and 2022. Leading up to the uprising of June 2022, there were 28 protest events; leading up to October 2019, there were 38. Currently, we have already had between 5 and 10 mobilisations, which indicates that concrete actions from different sectors are accumulating. First, there are scattered struggles, then they are articulated and, finally, they lead to social outbursts. This is a cyclical process, so I am not worried: governments can continue trying to repress, but sooner or later the issues come together and the struggle arises again.

What happened in the Amazon is a blow to Noboa's government. He governs with arrogance, with a monarchical vision, as if he were the landowner on a big estate. And in this case, he had to back down because the resistance affected him electorally. He didn't suspend the construction of the prison because he was concerned about life in the Amazon—for him, that region represents only 3% of the national electorate, he is not interested—but because he feared that this would impact his image in other parts of the country.

For now, the project is suspended and they have promised not to resume it. However, they have not provided any

official document to confirm this. We will continue to pay close attention to what happens.

IB: How have these protests influenced the mood of the campaign?

LI: I think that all mobilisations end up leading to a stance being taken. The first thing we must understand is that the political and economic elites have managed to implant the idea that politics is something negative for the popular sectors and their leaders. They have constructed the discourse that if we participate in politics, we do so for our own individual interests, that we are 'taking advantage' of the mobilisation to run for office.

They say, for example, 'There they are again, the golden ponchos, using the struggle to get into elections'. But when they stand for election, then it is democratic, then it is legitimate. And unfortunately, many people have fallen into that trap.

We, on the other hand, have been clear: without abandoning the streets, we are going to contest the elections as a further extension of the struggle. We are not abandoning the mobilisation, but complementing it with electoral participation. That is why the organised rank and file who have been on the streets are now taking a stand in this electoral situation.

A concrete example: our comrades who have been defending the hills and highland moors from extractivism. Yesterday I saw a statement that said: 'We're going with Leónidas Iza'. Not because they believe that the elections are an end in themselves, but because they understand that the electoral arena is another tool for channelling the strength built up in the streets.

Our struggle is not reduced to electoral politics; it is another dimension within a broader process. We fight in the streets, in national and international courts, in the construction and reform of laws, in local governments. What we have not yet fully achieved is to consolidate all these struggles under a unified project. We are on the way to doing that.

That is why I firmly believe that in time we will succeed in aligning the struggle towards a proposal that represents the interests of the people in this process.

IB: And what are the main planks of your programme for government?

LI: Well, when I am asked about 'my' government platform, we return to the same old stories that I have been fighting against these days. What is Leónidas Iza's government programme? No, because that is to individualise politics, to make people believe that it is about a personal interest. It is not about my programme, but the government programme of the people, the programme of the Indigenous peoples, of the cholos, of the Indians, of the mestizos, of the stigmatised Afro-Ecuadoreans.

Our government programme is not produced from behind a desk, but from grassroots struggle. It is the result of what we stood up for in 2019, of what we took to the streets in 2022. And that was clear: financial relief for the people, no mining in watersheds and fertile areas, real and deep implementation of plurinationality, and total rejection of privatisations.

In our government, we will strengthen the productive capacity of Ecuadorean state-owned companies and defend national production. What does this mean? That we are going to promote policies to support small farmers - those whom the state has abandoned but who were the first to take to the streets when the crisis hit. This is a government programme built from the people and for the people.

One of the central issues is insecurity. They have led us to believe that the solution is to put more weapons and more police on the streets. No. And in our government plan we have been clear: yes, there are some young people who have fallen into criminal networks and who we may not be able to rehabilitate socially, and we will have to face up to that. But insecurity cannot be combated with repression alone, but with a solid social policy linked to neighbourhoods, communes and territories.

We need to strengthen education and healthcare and create minimum employment conditions. Why? To prevent 12- or 13-year-olds, whose parents work in precarious conditions and cannot look after them, from being recruited by organised crime. This is the vision of the popular sectors, not of those who think that insecurity can be solved with a warmongering mentality, with more weapons and repression.

And what has happened? The state has been deliberately weakened, its capacity reduced under the pretext of combating its supposed 'obesity'. But when you dismantle the state, you dismantle the basic policies that sustain any society, be it in the first, second or third world.

In terms of the institutional framework, we are going to respect democracy. Why do we write democracy in the Constitution if each government then interprets it as it pleases, turning us into a monarchy? No!

Democracy cannot be a concept manipulated by political and economic groups as they see fit. It must be a democracy rooted in the people, not in the interests of an elite that uses it as an instrument to perpetuate its power.

IB: Halfway through last year, in Pachakutik, in CONAIE, I believe you tried to unify or at least bring together the different left-wing currents and groups. I understand that at least a minimum agreement was reached: not to attack each other and to support whoever reaches the second round. Is that agreement, even if minimal, still in place? How do you see the current situation and what is your position towards a possible second round?

LI: Yes, there is a general government programme that some sectors accepted, assuming that it should be the basis for an agreement. However, there are central issues that many of those who call themselves progressive are still not willing to stand firm on. Issues such as mining, bilingual education, redistribution of wealth, defence of national production and the public sector continue to be points of

dispute.

For example, on the mining issue, some people ask: 'Where are we going to get the money from?' The answer is clear: we have to collect it from those who aren't paying what they should. But many sectors lack the necessary determination to face these debates. These are pending issues that remain open and which, in the event that we are an option in the second round, could serve to unify the struggle even more from the perspective of the popular sectors.

Now, why have more pragmatic and long-term agreements not been reached? Precisely because of the history of how certain sectors have governed. They have not understood what plurinationality really means, nor have they accepted that the rights of Indigenous peoples are not a concession from the state or a favour from governments, but fundamental collective rights.

Free, prior and informed consent, the application of Indigenous justice, bilingual intercultural education, the defence of food sovereignty, of our culture and our languages... all these issues have been left at the mercy of the political will of the government in power, without any real commitment. And this historical debt has prevented true unification in this process. These are issues that still need to be resolved in any space for debate.

Until now, the non-aggression pact has been respected. But in political and ideological terms, we must take as a reference the structural problems that any government must overcome, regardless of who comes to power.

At the moment, there are candidates who claim to represent the left and others who present themselves as right-wing. They all try to present themselves as 'new'. But the real question is how much sensitivity and how much memory people have to recognise who can really be a real option for Ecuador.

IB: Sorry, Leónidas, but specifically, if you make it to the second round, you're obviously going to want the other left-wing parties to support you. Now, if the

scenario were different and the final contest were between Luisa González (the presidential candidate of Rafael Correa's Citizen Revolution movement) and Noboa, would you call for a vote for the Citizen Revolution?

LI: At the moment, I can't say what will happen in a second round. We are

focused on building our option in the first round. If we start discussing hypothetical scenarios now, people might end up voting in this first round for an option they don't really agree with.

That is why the responsible thing to do at the moment is not to speculate about the second round, but to consolidate our proposal and our

strength at this stage. Now, if we reach the second round, as I am sure we will be one of the options, at that point we will have to assess our capacity to integrate the different sectors of Ecuador and move forward based on that scenario.

[Jacobin Latin America](#). 3 February, 2025

Niger: for the release of Moussa Tchangari

7 February 2025, by [Paul Martial](#)

Serving the people

The dean of the examining magistrates notified him of two new charges, 'intelligence with enemy powers' and 'undermining national defence'. He has been transferred to Filingué prison, 180 km from the capital Niamey.

Amnesty International rightly describes Moussa as 'a prominent civil society leader'. In the 1980s, he was one of the leaders of the Union des Scolaires nigériens and fought for democratic rights. He was one of the leaders of the Coalition Against the High Cost of Living in 2005, organising demonstrations attended by over 100,000 people. He campaigned tirelessly for the defence of Niger's sovereignty at a time when successive governments were selling off uranium mining to the French multinational AREVA (formerly COGEMA), now ORANO. He has been jailed several times, including in 2015

when he was accused of 'undermining national defence'.

Repression and demagoguery

A few weeks after the coup d'état led by presidential guard general Abdourahamane Tiani in July 2023, Tchangari warned of the risks facing the country: 'The duty of all those who care about the future of the Sahel is therefore not only, in these conditions, to oppose the seizure of power by force and the authoritarian excesses that we are already seeing; but also to firmly reject the military's claim to be implementing the 'all-security' option that has failed with the civilian powers.'

No dissent from the government was accepted: journalists were imprisoned and opponents stripped of their nationality. As for the former

president, he has been arbitrarily detained since the coup 18 months ago.

Numerous appeals for the release of the AEC secretary have been published. The signatures include human rights organisations, academics, anti-globalisation activists and African anti-imperialist organisations such as the Malian party Solidarité africaine pour la démocratie et l'indépendance (SADI), which has also been the victim of repression by the coup plotters.

While Tchangari fought his long battle for the defence of human rights and the sovereignty of Niger, Tiani served the dictatorships in power with the docility required to rise from private second class to the rank of general, before discovering at just the right moment a nationalist and pan-Africanist streak... ideal for justifying his coup d'état.

[L'Anticapitaliste](#) 30 January 2025

Iran: Storm warning for the Islamic Republic

6 February 2025, by [Babak Kia](#)

With galloping hyperinflation, the collapse of the national currency, gas and electricity shortages, regular production stoppages and untimely closures of factories and administrations, the entire economy has been hit by an unprecedented crisis. Although Iran has the world's

second-largest gas reserves and third-largest oil reserves, the population lacks everything: more than 60% of the population lives below the poverty line. Unpaid wages are on the increase.

Deep popular protest and

repression

In 2024, 2,396 demonstrations and 169 strikes were recorded. Due to censorship, these figures are undoubtedly lower than the reality. These protests by workers of all categories (teachers, nurses, manual workers, municipal employees, pensioners, etc.) and from all sectors, including the strategic petrochemicals industry, took place in all 31 regions of the country. The demands concerned wages, social protection, pensions, employment contracts and the abolition of daily working hours.

The Islamic Republic, a capitalist and theocratic dictatorship, responded with systematic brutality. The regime's first weapon is to continue to ban the right to organise and form trade unions. The authorities are seeking to prevent any structuring or coordination of social protest. Workers' activists are constantly being arrested and sentenced. Often dismissed from their jobs, they are subjected to intimidation and various forms of pressure on a regular basis during their detention and when they are released.

Faced with regional defeats, the social crisis and the struggles, the Islamic Republic has tried in recent weeks to flex its muscles by conducting military manoeuvres designed to dissuade the colonialist state of Israel and US

imperialism from attacking Iran. At the same time, it has deployed Basij militias in the streets to create a climate of fear. A clear message sent to those who constantly challenge the authorities.

But these gesticulations do not put an end to mobilisations, acts of civil disobedience, collective or individual resistance. The assassination in broad daylight of two Supreme Court judges on 18 January testifies to the fragility of the government. Known for their summary trials of opponents and directly responsible for the execution of many political prisoners, no one will mourn the deaths of Judges Razini and Moghisseh.

Putting an end to the Islamic Republic

Every time the regime fears for its survival, its violence against its opponents becomes more ferocious. In 2024, the Islamic Republic murdered more than 900 prisoners. And since autumn 2024, the authorities have even stepped up the pace, executing more than three prisoners a day. Kurds and Baluchis are the first victims, demonstrating the systemic racism of the regime. 51 prisoners of conscience are on death row. Campaigns against the death penalty

are organised from inside the prisons themselves, before spreading outside the country. This is particularly the case for Varisheh Moradi and Pakhshan Azizi, two Kurdish activists, for whom various appeals and petitions are circulating. [1] A well-attended one-day general strike was called in Kurdistan on Wednesday 22 January to protest against their sentencing.

Against the capitalist and obscurantist regime of the mullahs, which is showing many signs of weakness, it is important to develop support here and now for those who are fighting for social justice, democracy, gender equality and the defence of national and religious minorities. It is high time to put an end to the Islamic Republic. To achieve this, the youth, women, workers and peoples of Iran need international solidarity. The fall of the regime through a popular victory and without imperialist interference would be a tremendous encouragement for all the peoples of the region and the world.

L'Anticapitaliste 30 January, 2025

Footnotes

[1] <https://amnesty.ca/participate/2024/iran/act-against-condemnation-death-of-pakhshan-azizi>

The Age of Neofascism and Its Distinctive Features

5 February 2025, by Gilbert Achcar

Neofascism claims to respect the basic rules of democracy instead of establishing a naked dictatorship as its predecessor did, even when it empties democracy of its content by eroding actual political freedoms to varying degrees, depending on the true level of popularity of each neofascist ruler (and thus his need or not to rig elections) and the balance of power between him and his opponents. There is today a wide

range of degrees of neofascist tyranny, from near absolute in the case of Vladimir Putin to what still retains a space of political liberalism as in the cases of Donald Trump and Narendra Modi.

Neofascism differs from traditional despotic or authoritarian regimes (such as the Chinese government or most Arab regimes) in that it is based, like last century's fascism, on an

aggressive, militant mobilization of its popular base on an ideological basis similar to that which characterized its predecessor. This base includes various components of far-right thinking: nationalist and ethnic fanaticism, xenophobia, explicit racism, assertive masculinity, and extreme hostility to Enlightenment and emancipatory values.

As for the differences between old and

new fascism, the most important of them are, first, that neofascism does not rely on the paramilitary forces that characterized the old version – not in the sense that it is devoid of them, but it keeps them in a reserve role behind the scenes, when they are present – and, second, that neo-fascism does not claim to be “socialist” like its predecessor. Its program does not lead to the expansion of the state apparatus and its economic role but rather draws inspiration from neoliberal thinking in its call to reduce the economic role of the state in favour of private capital. However, necessity may make it go in the opposite direction, as is the case with Putin’s regime under the pressure of the requirements of the war he launched against Ukraine.

While twentieth-century fascism grew in the context of the severe economic crisis that followed World War I and reached its peak with the “Great Depression”, neofascism grew in the context of the worsening crisis of neoliberalism, especially after the “Great Recession” that resulted from the financial crisis of 2007-08. Whereas past century’s fascism endorsed the national and ethnic hostilities that prevailed in the heart of the European continent, against the backdrop of the heinous racist practices that were occurring in the colonized countries, neofascism flourished on the dung of racist, xenophobic resentment against the rising waves of immigration that accompanied neoliberal globalization or resulted from the wars that the latter fuelled, in parallel with the collapse of the rules of the international system. The United States played the key role in thwarting the development of a rules-based international system after the end of the Cold War, thus quickly plunging the world into a New Cold War.

Neofascism may seem less dangerous

than its predecessor because it is not based on paramilitary appearances and because nuclear deterrence makes a new world war unlikely (but not impossible: the Ukraine war has brought the world closer to the possibility of a new world war than any events since World War II, even at the height of the Cold War in the time of the USSR). The truth, however, is that neofascism is more dangerous in some respects than the old. Twentieth-century fascism was based on a triangle of powers (Germany, Italy, and Japan) that did not have the objective ability to achieve its dream of world dominance, and was confronted by powers that were economically superior to it (the United States and Britain) in addition to the Soviet Union and the global communist movement (the latter played a major role in confronting fascism politically and militarily).

As for neofascism, its dominance over the world is increasing, driven by the return of Donald Trump to the US presidency in a guise that is much more in line with neofascism than during his first term. Thus, the world’s greatest economic and military power is today the spearhead of neofascism, with which various governments in Russia, India, Israel, Argentina, Hungary and other countries converge, while the possibility of neofascist parties coming to power in the major European countries (in France and Germany, after Italy, and even in Britain) looms on the horizon, not to mention smaller countries in Central and Eastern Europe in particular.

If it is true that the possibility of a new world war remains limited, our world faces something no less dangerous than the two world wars of the twentieth century, namely climate change, which threatens the future of the planet and of humanity. Neofascism is pushing the world

towards the abyss with the blatant hostility of most of its factions to indispensable environmental measures, thus exacerbating the environmental peril, especially when neofascism has taken over the reins of power over the most polluting people in the world proportionally to its number, namely the people of the United States.

There is no equivalent in today’s world to what the workers’ movement was like with its socialist and communist wings after World War I. Instead, the forces of the left are suffering from atrophy in most countries, after most of them merged into the crucible of neoliberalism to the point that they no longer constitute an alternative to the status quo in the eyes of society. Or else, they are unable to adapt to the requirements of our era, reproducing the flaws of the twentieth century’s left that led to its historical bankruptcy. All the above makes us uphold that the era of neofascism is more dangerous in some respects than the era of the old. The new generation remains the focus of our greatest hope, and significant sections of it have revealed their rejection of racism, such as that manifested in the Zionist genocidal war in Gaza, and their defence of equality of all sorts of rights, as well, of course, as their defence of the environment.

In the face of the global rise of neofascism, there is a vital and urgent need to confront it by bringing together the broadest ad hoc alliances in defence of democracy, the environment, and gender and migrants rights, with the variety of forces that embrace these goals, while working to rebuild a global current opposing neoliberalism and defending the public interest in the face of the dominance of private interests.

Source: [Gilbert Achcar blog](#), 4 February 2025

Greece: Mobilisation for the environment, a

key issue

4 February 2025, by [Andreas Sartzekis](#)

The huge annual fires have given rise to few preventive programmes. On the contrary, the Right has refused to extend the contracts of 5,000 temporary firefighters. As if the winter months were not useful for training in studying and fighting megafires, when this summer the flames reached the Athenian suburbs. The same goes for floods: while in 2023 the region of Thessaly was ravaged, with 17 deaths and lasting consequences affecting this agricultural region, the government is content to blame climate change, without any overall reflection or emergency measures.

Polluting industries without filters

In the industrial sector, every effort is being made to impose dangerous extraction facilities. The best-known example is the Skouriès gold mines in the north of the country, where, despite resistance from the local population, the Ellinikos Chryssos company is able to continue its activities, after violent repression in the past, manipulation of the miners by management and a recent lawsuit against a news website. Today, in the north of the island of Chios, the government is trying to impose a project for an antimony mine, a material that is highly dangerous to

health and whose dust is likely to cover the whole island with the frequent northerly winds.

Voltaic power and wind turbines, a smoke and mirrors approach

Voltaic and wind farms are everywhere in Greece. This is in line with a project whose stated aim is for green electricity to reach 80% of total production, instead of the current 30%. But behind this virtuous objective, it is a catastrophic capitalist project that Mitsotakis wants to impose in the hope that in the medium term, Greece will become an exporter of green energy. We're right in the middle of this offensive, with plans for floating voltaic farms in the Gulf of Ambracique, which has been classified as a national park and Natura 2000 site. Faced with this project, fishermen are joining forces with environmental organisations and scientists to organise resistance.

Organising resistance

Resistance is much more widespread when it comes to opposing wind turbines: without exaggeration, it can

be said that all the mountains are under threat (70 200-metre wind turbines are planned for the mountains of the eastern Peloponnese), and you only have to follow the road from Thebes to Delphi to see the mess. There is, of course, the aesthetic issue, which deserves to be debated, but which is obvious for a country that could develop a form of 'soft tourism' that is hardly compatible with these giant parks. Above all, they have an immediate impact on fauna - in regions where livestock farming is under threat - and flora, with roads cut into the mountains right up to the summits, which, contrary to what the Ministry of the Environment and Energy (YPEN) claims, increases the risk of landslides and fires.

The same is true of proposed offshore parks, as is planned for Samothrace: efforts to protect the necessary 'sustainable fisheries' would be ruined by the implementation of such projects. Faced with this situation, local residents are all the more determined to organise their refusal because they are generally not consulted and are aware that these projects are designed solely for the energy companies and their export plans. There is coordination in various places, and many initiatives of resistance. It might be time to prepare a new national initiative, as in December 2023.

[L'Anticapitaliste](#), 30 January 2025

Elon Musk Is Leading an Electronic Coup D'État

3 February 2025, by [Dan La Botz](#)

Controlling the executive branch, both houses of Congress, and the Supreme Court, Trump apparently believes that he and Musk have the power to carry out a coup with impunity. With Trump having purged the Justice Department,

the FBI, the Inspectors General, there is, in fact, no one to call out and stop these attacks on the government bureaucracy from within. The Democrats and groups such as the ACLU have been filing suit in various

courts with some success, but if they end up at the Supreme Court, given that the Supreme Court ruled in July 2024 that the U.S. presidents have absolute immunity for their official actions and broad immunity for most

other actions, Trump is likely to win.

Trump and Musk, who have been calling for reducing the size and cost of government, now have the power with the push of a computer key to stop the two trillion dollars in payments made by Treasury each year affecting tens of millions of people from children to the disabled to the elderly, local and state governments, and private contractors. They now

have their hands on the computers at OPM that handles the records of virtually all 2.5 million government employees. And have taken over the computers at the GSA oversees government real estate, land and buildings. Musk's team now had its hands on computer that manage almost \$43 billion in foreign aid for foreign economies, education, and health, such as for HIV programs. Trump and his pliant Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth already control the U.S.

military's \$820 billion budget.

We are witnessing a tech coup d'état. The Democratic Party has failed to stop Trump and Musk, and at the moment has no plan to do so. The social movements and the left are too weak and distant from power to do anything immediately and are only likely to develop a strategy when Trump's attack on the lives of millions of Americans forces them to act.

“Unity and radicality”

2 February 2025, by [Olivier Besancenot](#)

You were one of the best-known left-wing politicians of the 2000s, then went back to work as a postman. Rather atypical for a politician, isn't it?

I never stopped working as a postman. During election campaigns, I was able to take two months off, but otherwise I kept my job. In our organization, there is no post of general secretary, treasurer or anything else.

In opinion polls in France, Marine Le Pen of the 'Rassemblement National' is regularly in the lead. Does she belong to the same liberal economic line as Trump, Meloni and Milei, or are there differences?

Marine Le Pen undoubtedly belongs to this authoritarian neo-fascist movement. Admittedly, she presents herself in a slightly more social way than the AfD in Germany, but that's for tactical reasons. When the population fought against raising the retirement age, Le Pen became a little less economically liberal. But she soon changed her mind. I'd say she's adapting to public opinion.

Neo-liberal economic policy, racist police violence, neo-colonialism in Africa and Oceania - all this is already happening today under President Macron. What would get even worse under Le Pen?

First and foremost, repression in poor neighbourhoods would increase

further. Racism and Islamophobia are at the root of the far right - something that is closely linked to France's colonial history. And this development is of course not just linked to election results. It is a process that we have been observing for many years and to which Macron's policies have largely contributed.

With the creation of the New Popular Front last year, a counter-movement against the right has finally seen the light of day. What distinguishes the Nouveau Front Populaire (NFP) from previous left-wing alliances in which your organization was not involved?

There are two differences: firstly, last year everyone saw the need to block the extreme right. Secondly, the NFP was more than an electoral association between the parties. Of course, the agreements between the party leaderships were the condition of its existence, but the Popular Front was also supported by social movements and trade unions. For example, the feminist organization Planning familial, the Jewish anti-colonial platform Tsedek!, ATTAC and local trade union committees. It was like a social magma. No left-wing electoral alliance in recent decades could compare with this project.

After the majority of social-democrat MPs voted for the conservative prime minister Bayrou in December, the alliance has already shattered. What does

this mean for the anti-fascist resistance?

In some places there are still local NFP groups, but yes: overall, the alliance has collapsed. The responsibility for this lies with the leaderships of the left-wing parties - socialists, communists, ecologists and partly also France Insoumise. They needed the Popular Front to win constituencies in the parliamentary elections. But they were clearly not that interested in social mobilization.

What lies behind the PS's decision to withdraw from the alliance? Was it the classic 'social-democratic betrayal' - or a more complex issue?

It was obviously more complex. Social democracy did what it always does: it entered into an alliance with a party of the state apparatus so as not to have to be reformist. Reformism would mean wresting social and ecological change from the 'market economy'. On the other hand, the disintegration of the NFP is linked to the French presidential system. Although the left won the elections, President Macron was able to appoint a man from the right to head the government. And now everyone - including the left - is under the illusion that a victory in the presidential elections would solve the big problems. That's why 'La France Insoumise' and the PS are doing everything they can to put forward their candidates Jean-Luc Mélenchon and François Hollande. The advantage

in France, however, is that there is a vibrant extra-parliamentary movement, as the Gilets jaunes protests or the fight against pension reform have shown.

From the outside, La France insoumise has evolved. Mélenchon's party has succeeded in making migrant and anti-racist positions much more visible than before.

Yes, I would say that the party has shown that it has solid backing. The big media groups, such as billionaire Vincent Bolloré's CNews news channel, stir up hatred of Arabs and the left. It is on this axis that the right-wing movement in France is now operating. And La France Insoumise has not given in to this fundamental

movement, but has become more radical on certain issues - Palestine and Islamophobia, for example. It was different a few years ago, when France Insoumise defended debates as statist as those of the left in Germany. However, I see a problem in the fact that here too, everything is focused on early presidential elections. It's obvious that the crisis is far too deep and the right far too strong for new elections to pave the way for a solution.

What could be the strategy for halting the Right's triumphant march?

Above all, we must not despair. That may sound silly, but it's important. Last June, we saw in France that the tide could turn. A week before the second round, a victory for the 'new

popular front' was still totally unimaginable. But it succeeded - because there was a political programme that was certainly not revolutionary, but which contained concrete social improvements. For me, this shows that we must actively combine unity and radicalism. It's difficult, but there is no alternative. One encouraging development in France is the tactical and strategic debates that are taking place all over the place - in neighbourhoods, trade unions, internationalist, feminist and LGBTI movements. Many of these relationships were unimaginable until recently. We need to understand that this is an open historical moment.

31 January 2025

*Translated by **International Viewpoint** from*